

Combinatorial properties of classical forcing notions

JÖRG BRENDLE*

Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, 52900 Ramat-Gan, Israel

and

Mathematisches Institut der Universität Tübingen, Auf der Morgenstelle 10, 72076 Tübingen, Germany

ABSTRACT

We investigate the effect of adding a single real (for various forcing notions adding reals) on cardinal invariants associated with the continuum. We show: (1) adding an eventually different or a localization real adjoins a Luzin set of size continuum and a mad family of size ω_1 ; (2) Laver and Mathias forcing collapse the dominating number to ω_1 , and thus two Laver or Mathias reals added iteratively always force CH ; (3) Miller's rational perfect set forcing preserves the axiom $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$.

* The author wishes to thank the MINERVA-foundation for supporting him

Introduction

In [Ro], Roitman proved that adding a Cohen real preserves the axiom $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$. However, larger fragments of MA can fail in the extension. In fact, Woodin [Wo], and (independently, but later) Cichoń and Pawlikowski [CP] showed that MA for random forcing fails after adjoining a Cohen real. The latter authors investigated as well the effect of adding a Cohen or a random real on cardinal invariants in Cichoń's diagram (see [CP] and [Pa 2] — these are cardinals associated with the ideals of meager and null sets on the real line as well as the unbounding and dominating numbers — see section 1 for definitions). Recently, Judah, Shelah and the present author did the same for Hechler forcing [BJS]. We continue this line of research for other forcing notions adding a single real — in particular for forcings involved in consistency proofs in Cichoń's diagram —; and the present work should be looked at as a companion piece to [BJS].

After reviewing the forcing notions as well as the cardinal invariants we shall be considering in our work in section 1, we will show in 2.1. that many *ccc* forcing notions (including Miller's eventually different reals forcing [Mi 1, section 5] as well as Bartoszyński's localization forcing) add a Luzin set of size 2^ω . Remember that an uncountable set of reals $X \subseteq 2^\omega$ is *Luzin* iff it has at most countable intersection with every meager set. — We shall then sketch how some changes in the argument prove that the forcings considered in 2.1. produce a maximal almost disjoint family of subsets of ω of size ω_1 (Theorem 2.3.). Recall that $A, B \subseteq \omega$ are said to be *almost disjoint* (*a. d.* for short) iff $|A \cap B| < \omega$; $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is an *a. d. family* iff the members of $\mathcal{A}$ are pairwise a. d.; and $\mathcal{A}$ is a *mad family* (*maximal almost disjoint family*) iff it is a. d. and maximal with this property. — We close section 2 with consequences of adding an eventually different (localization) real on the cardinals in Cichoń's diagram.

The third section is devoted to Laver and Mathias forcings (and their versions with ultrafilters). Recall that given reals $f, g \in \omega^\omega$, f *eventually dominates* g iff $\forall^\infty n (f(n) > g(n))$ (where $\forall^\infty n$ denotes *for almost all* n ; similarly $\exists^\infty n$ stands for *there exist infinitely many* n). $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ is a *dominating family* iff for all $g \in \omega^\omega$ there is $f \in \mathcal{F}$ eventually dominating g . We shall prove in 3.1. that Laver (Mathias) forcing adjoins a dominating family of size ω_1 . An immediate consequence of this is that two Laver (Mathias) reals added

iteratively always force CH (Corollary 3.10). — Theorem 3.1. enables us to investigate the effect of adding a Laver real on the invariants in Cichoń’s diagram under the assumption that $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$ holds. Such an assumption (or slightly less) is necessary to ensure that no cardinals are collapsed. Our results which are expounded in 3.4. in fact yield an alternative argument for proving one of the consistency results concerning cardinals in Cichoń’s diagram which was originally obtained by Bartoszyński, Judah and Shelah [BaJS] using a countable support iteration.

In section 4 we leave our combinatorial considerations for a while to deal with some descriptive set theory instead. Recall that a set of reals $A \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is *Ramsey* iff there is $a \in [\omega]^\omega$ so that either $[a]^\omega \subseteq A$ or $[a]^\omega \subseteq [\omega]^\omega \setminus A$. We shall show that $\Sigma_4^1\text{-Mathias-absoluteness}$ (which means that V and $V[m]$, where m is Mathias-generic over V , satisfy the same Σ_4^1 -sentences with parameters in V) implies that all Σ_3^1 -sets are Ramsey.

Section 5 studies Miller’s rational perfect set forcing [Mi 2]. It turns out (Theorem 5.1.) that the effect of a Miller real is rather different from the one of the forcing notions considered in sections 2 and 3; namely Miller forcing *preserves the axiom* $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$ (which means that given a model V for “ $MA(\sigma\text{-centered}) + 2^\omega = \kappa$ ” (κ regular uncountable), “ $MA(\sigma\text{-centered}) + 2^\omega = \kappa$ ” is still true in $V[m]$, where m is Miller-generic over V). In so far its behaviour is similar to the one of Cohen forcing (see above). Furthermore it collapses the *additivity of Lebesgue measure* (the smallest size of a family of null sets the union of which is not null) to ω_1 (Theorem 5.6.).

A note for the reader. We think of Theorems 2.1. and 3.1. (and, to a lesser extent, 5.1.) as the main results of this work.

Sections 2, 3 and 5 are independent of each other, and can be read without knowledge of the preceding sections (but not without some sophistication in forcing arguments). [However, one argument in 5.6. is exactly similar to the corresponding argument in the proof of 3.4., and is therefore left out.] The results of section 4 heavily depend on the proof of Theorem 3.1. and the fact that Mathias forcing satisfies the requirements of 3.1. (Corollary 3.10), but not on the remainder of section 3.

Notation. Our notation is fairly standard. We refer the reader to [Je 1] and [Ku] for set theory in general and forcing in particular.

Given a finite sequence σ (e.g. $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$), we let $lh(\sigma) := dom(\sigma)$ denote the length

of σ ; for $\ell \in lh(\sigma)$, $\sigma \restriction \ell$ is the restriction of σ to ℓ . $\hat{}$ is used for concatenation of sequences; and $\langle \rangle$ is the empty sequence. Given a tree $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$, $[T] := \{f \in \omega^\omega; \forall n (f \restriction n \in T)\}$ denotes the set of its branches.

A partial order (p.o. for short) is called σ -centered iff $\mathbb{P} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathbb{P}_n$ where each $\mathbb{P}_n$ is *centered* (i.e., given $F \subseteq \mathbb{P}_n$ finite, there is $q \in \mathbb{P}$ so that for all $p \in F$ ($q \leq p$)); and $\mathbb{P}$ is σ -linked iff $\mathbb{P} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathbb{P}_n$ where each $\mathbb{P}_n$ is *linked* (i.e., given $p, q \in \mathbb{P}_n$, there is $r \in \mathbb{P}$ so that $r \leq p$ and $r \leq q$). A σ -centered p.o. is σ -linked; and a σ -linked p.o. is *ccc*. An example for a σ -linked not σ -centered p.o. is random forcing, henceforth denoted by $\mathbb{B}$.

Given a p.o. $\mathbb{P} \in V$, we shall denote $\mathbb{P}$ -names by symbols like $\check{f}, \check{T}, \check{t}, \dots$ and their interpretation in $V[G]$ (where G is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over V) by $\check{f}[G], \check{T}[G], \check{t}[G], \dots$. We confuse to some extent Boolean-valued models $V^\mathbb{P}$ and forcing extensions $V[G]$, where G is $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over V . For a sentence of the $\mathbb{P}$ -forcing language ϕ , $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket$ is the Boolean value of ϕ . The symbol $\star$ denotes iteration. — We say a forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ is *generated by a name for a real* iff there is a $\mathbb{P}$ -name $\check{r}$ for an object in ω^ω so that the complete Boolean algebra generated by the family $\{\llbracket \check{r}(i) = n \rrbracket; i, n \in \omega\}$ equals $r.o.(\mathbb{P})$; we express this by saying $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_{\check{r}}$; and we usually denote this name by the same letter as the forcing notion (e.g., $\mathbb{M}$ for Mathias forcing, and $\check{m}$ for the name of the Mathias-generic real).

Whenever we use Σ_n^1 or Π_n^1 we mean the boldface version.

Acknowledgment. I am very much indebted to Haim Judah for motivating me to work on the problems considered in this paper and for various discussions concerning the results.

1. Frontispiece — forcing notions and cardinal invariants

1.1. Forcing notions. We shall consider the following forcing notions.

— *Eventually different reals forcing* $\mathbb{E}$ [Mi 1, section 5]:

$$(s, G) \in \mathbb{E} \iff s \in \omega^{<\omega} \wedge G \in [\omega^\omega]^{<\omega}$$

$$(s, G) \leq (t, H) \iff s \supseteq t \wedge G \supseteq H \wedge \forall g \in H \forall i (dom(t) \leq i < dom(s) \rightarrow s(i) \neq g(i))$$

— *Localization forcing* $\mathbb{L}$ (see, e.g., [Tr 3, § 2]):

$$\begin{aligned}
(\sigma, G) \in \mathbb{L} &\iff \sigma \in ([\omega]^{<\omega})^{<\omega} \wedge \forall i \in \text{dom}(\sigma) (|\sigma(i)| = i + 1) \wedge G \in [\omega^\omega]^{\leq \text{dom}(\sigma)+1} \\
(\sigma, G) \leq (\tau, H) &\iff \sigma \supseteq \tau \wedge G \supseteq H \wedge \forall g \in H \forall i (\text{dom}(\tau) \leq i < \text{dom}(\sigma) \rightarrow g(i) \in \sigma(i))
\end{aligned}$$

— *Mathias forcing* $\mathbb{M}$ [Je 2, part one, section 3]:

$$\begin{aligned}
(s, S) \in \mathbb{M} &\iff s \in \omega^{<\omega} \wedge S \in [\omega]^\omega \wedge s \text{ strictly increasing} \wedge \max(\text{ran}(s)) < \min(S) \\
(s, S) \leq (t, T) &\iff s \supseteq t \wedge S \subseteq T \wedge \forall i \in (\text{lh}(s) \setminus \text{lh}(t)) (s(i) \in T)
\end{aligned}$$

— *Laver forcing* $\mathbb{LA}$ [Je 2, part one, section 3]:

$$\begin{aligned}
T \in \mathbb{LA} &\iff T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega} \text{ is a tree} \wedge \exists \rho \in T \forall \sigma \in T (\sigma \subseteq \rho \vee [\rho \subseteq \sigma \wedge \exists^\infty n (\sigma^\frown \langle n \rangle \in T)]) \\
T \leq S &\iff T \subseteq S
\end{aligned}$$

The ρ required to exist in the above definition is usually called the *stem* of T , $\text{stem}(T)$. Furthermore, for $\rho \in T$ we let $\text{succ}_T(\rho) := \{n \in \omega; \rho^\frown \langle n \rangle \in T\}$, the set of *successors* of ρ in T , and $T_\rho := \{\sigma \in T; \sigma \subseteq \rho \vee \rho \subseteq \sigma\}$. We say $T \leq_0 S$ iff $T \leq S$ and $\text{stem}(T) = \text{stem}(S)$.

Given a non-principal ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$ of subsets of ω , we can define *Mathias forcing with respect to $\mathcal{U}$* , $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}$, as well as *Laver forcing with respect to $\mathcal{U}$* , $\mathbb{LA}_{\mathcal{U}}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
(s, S) \in \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}} &\iff (s, S) \in \mathbb{M} \wedge S \in \mathcal{U} \\
T \in \mathbb{LA}_{\mathcal{U}} &\iff T \in \mathbb{LA} \wedge \forall \sigma \in T (\text{stem}(T) \subseteq \sigma \longrightarrow \text{succ}_T(\sigma) \in \mathcal{U})
\end{aligned}$$

The order is the restriction of the Mathias order (Laver order, respectively).

A non-principal ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$ over ω is called *Ramsey* iff for every partition $\mathcal{A}$ of ω so that $A \notin \mathcal{U}$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists $B \in \mathcal{U}$ so that for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $|B \cap A| \leq 1$. We note that Mathias forcing $\mathbb{M}$ is equivalent (from the forcing-theoretic point of view) to the two-step iteration $P(\omega)/\text{fin} \star \mathbb{M}_{\check{\mathcal{U}}}$, where $(P(\omega)/\text{fin}, \leq)$ is the $(\sigma$ -closed) Boolean algebra of subsets of ω modulo the finite sets ordered by almost inclusion (i.e. for A and $B \in [\omega]^\omega$, $A \leq B$ iff $A \subseteq^* B$ iff $A \setminus B$ is finite) which generically adjoins a Ramsey ultrafilter $\check{\mathcal{U}}$ [Ma, 4.9.]. Also, several people have observed (see [Bl, pp. 238–239] or [JS 1, section 1]) that for Ramsey ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}$, the forcings $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\mathbb{LA}_{\mathcal{U}}$ are equivalent.

— *Miller forcing* $\mathbb{MI}$ [Mi 2]:

$$\begin{aligned}
T \in \mathbb{MI} &\iff T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega} \text{ is a tree} \wedge \forall \rho \in T \exists \sigma \in T (\rho \subseteq \sigma \wedge \exists^\infty n (\sigma^\frown \langle n \rangle \in T)) \\
T \leq S &\iff T \subseteq S
\end{aligned}$$

We note that conditions T so that for all $\rho \in T$ either $\exists! n (\rho^\frown \langle n \rangle \in T)$ or $\exists^\infty n (\rho^\frown \langle n \rangle \in T)$ are dense in $\mathbb{MI}$, and henceforth restrict our attention to such conditions. For such a condition T we let $\text{stem}(T) =$ the unique $\rho \in T$ of minimal length so that $\exists^\infty n (\rho^\frown \langle n \rangle \in T)$;

$split(T) = \{\rho \in T; \exists^\infty n (\rho \hat{\langle} n \rangle \in T)\}$; and for $\rho \in split(T)$, $succ_T(\rho) = \{\sigma \in split(T); \rho \subseteq \sigma \wedge \text{for no } lh(\rho) < n < lh(\sigma) (\sigma \restriction n \in split(T))\}$.

1.2. Cardinal invariants. Given a σ -ideal $\mathcal{I} \subseteq P(2^\omega)$, we let

$add(\mathcal{I}) :=$ the least κ such that $\exists \mathcal{F} \in [\mathcal{I}]^\kappa (\bigcup \mathcal{F} \notin \mathcal{I})$;
 $cov(\mathcal{I}) :=$ the least κ such that $\exists \mathcal{F} \in [\mathcal{I}]^\kappa (\bigcup \mathcal{F} = 2^\omega)$;
 $unif(\mathcal{I}) :=$ the least κ such that $[2^\omega]^\kappa \setminus \mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$;
 $cof(\mathcal{I}) :=$ the least κ such that $\exists \mathcal{F} \in [\mathcal{I}]^\kappa \forall A \in \mathcal{I} \exists B \in \mathcal{F} (A \subseteq B)$.

We also define

$\mathbf{b} :=$ the least κ such that $\exists \mathcal{F} \in [\omega^\omega]^\kappa \forall f \in \omega^\omega \exists g \in \mathcal{F} \exists^\infty n (g(n) > f(n))$;
 $\mathbf{d} :=$ the least κ such that $\exists \mathcal{F} \in [\omega^\omega]^\kappa \forall f \in \omega^\omega \exists g \in \mathcal{F} \forall^\infty n (g(n) > f(n))$.

If $\mathcal{M}$ is the ideal of meager sets, and $\mathcal{L}$ is the ideal of null sets, then we can arrange these cardinals in the following diagram (called Cichoń's diagram).

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & cov(\mathcal{L}) & & unif(\mathcal{M}) & & cof(\mathcal{M}) & & cof(\mathcal{L}) & & 2^\omega \\
 & & & \mathbf{b} & & \mathbf{d} & & & & \\
 \omega_1 & & add(\mathcal{L}) & & add(\mathcal{M}) & & cov(\mathcal{M}) & & unif(\mathcal{L}) &
 \end{array}$$

(Here, the invariants grow larger, as one moves up and to the right in the diagram.) The dotted line says that $add(\mathcal{M}) = \min\{b, cov(\mathcal{M})\}$ and $cof(\mathcal{M}) = \max\{d, unif(\mathcal{M})\}$. For the results which determine the shape of this diagram, we refer the reader to [Fr]. A survey on independence proofs showing that no other relations can be proved between these cardinals can be found in [BaJS]. We shall need the following characterization of the cardinal $add(\mathcal{L})$, which is due to Bartoszyński [Ba]: call a function $\phi \in ([\omega]^{<\omega})^\omega$ a *slalom* iff for all $n \in \omega$ ($|\phi(n)| \leq n$); let Φ be the set of all slaloms; then

$add(\mathcal{L}) =$ the least κ such that $\exists \mathcal{F} \in [\omega^\omega]^\kappa \forall \phi \in \Phi \exists f \in \mathcal{F} \exists^\infty n (f(n) \notin \phi(n))$.

In addition, we shall be interested in the following cardinals:

$\mathbf{p} :=$ the least κ so that there is $\mathcal{F} \in [[\omega]^\omega]^\kappa$ with the *strong finite intersection property* (i.e. given finitely many $A_i \in \mathcal{F}$, $i < n$, we have $|\bigcap_{i < n} A_i| = \omega$) so that $\neg \exists B \in [\omega]^\omega \forall A \in \mathcal{F} (B \subseteq^* A)$;

- a** := the least κ so that there is a mad family of size κ ;
- s** := the least κ so that $\exists \mathcal{F} \in [[\omega]^\omega]^\kappa \forall B \in [\omega]^\omega \exists A \in \mathcal{F} (|A \cap B| = |B \setminus A| = \omega)$;
- r** := the least κ so that $\exists \mathcal{F} \in [[\omega]^\omega]^\kappa \forall A \in [\omega]^\omega \exists B \in \mathcal{F} (|A \cap B| < \omega \vee |B \setminus A| < \omega)$;
- h** := the least κ so that there is $\mathcal{F} \in [[[\omega]^\omega]^{\leq 2^\omega}]^\kappa$ so that all $A \in \mathcal{F}$ are mad and there is no mad $\mathcal{B}$ with $\forall A \in \mathcal{F} \forall B \in \mathcal{B} \exists A \in \mathcal{A} (B \subseteq^* A)$.

Bell's Theorem says that $2^\omega = \mathbf{p}$ is equivalent to $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$ [Be]. It is well-known that $\omega_1 \leq \mathbf{p} \leq \text{add}(\mathcal{M})$; that $\mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{h} \leq \mathbf{s} \leq \text{unif}(\mathcal{M}), \text{unif}(\mathcal{L}), \mathbf{d}$; that $\mathbf{h} \leq \mathbf{b} \leq \mathbf{a}$; and that $\mathbf{b}, \text{cov}(\mathcal{L}), \text{cov}(\mathcal{M}) \leq \mathbf{r} \leq 2^\omega$ [vD].

1.3. The forcings in 1.1. and the cardinals in 1.2. are far from being unrelated. In fact, some of the former were devised to yield consistency results concerning the latter using an iterated forcing construction. However, although it is well-known which value the cardinals will have after iterating one of the forcings, it has not yet been investigated what their values are after adding just one real.

2. The theme — adding large Luzin sets and small mad families

In this section we show that many *ccc* forcing notions which have been considered in literature adjoin a Luzin set of size 2^ω and a mad family of size ω_1 .

Assume we have at most countable sets A_ℓ, B_ℓ , natural numbers n_ℓ , relations $R_\ell \subseteq A_\ell \times [B_\ell]^{<\omega}$ and partitions $A_\ell = \bigcup_{k \in m_\ell} C_{k,\ell}$ for $\ell \in \omega$ such that

- (i) $|A_\ell|, |B_\ell|, n_\ell, m_\ell$ increase and converge to ω for $\ell \rightarrow \omega$ (possibly $|A_\ell|, |B_\ell|, m_\ell = \omega$);
- (ii) for all $\ell \in \omega$, if $S \subseteq T \subseteq B_\ell$ are finite and $a \in A_\ell$, then $a R_\ell T$ implies $a R_\ell S$;
- (iii) for all $\ell \in \omega$, if $S, T \subseteq B_\ell$ are finite, $|T| \leq n_\ell$ and (necessarily) $S \not\subseteq T$, then there is $a \in A_\ell$ with $\neg(a R_\ell S)$ and $a R_\ell T$;
- (iv) for all $\ell \in \omega$, given $S \subseteq B_\ell$ of size $\leq n_\ell$ and $k \in m_\ell$, there is $a \in C_{k,\ell}$ with $a R_\ell S$.

We define a forcing notion $\mathbb{I}$ associated with this situation as follows.

$$(\sigma, G) \in \mathbb{I} \iff \exists \ell \in \omega (\sigma \in \prod_{i \in \ell} A_i \wedge G \in [\prod_{i \in \omega} B_i]^{\leq n_\ell})$$

$$(\tau, H) \leq (\sigma, G) \iff \tau \supseteq \sigma \wedge H \supseteq G \wedge \forall i \in \text{dom}(\tau) \setminus \text{dom}(\sigma) (\tau(i) R_i \{g(i); g \in G\})$$

We call $\mathbb{I}$ an *inflexible* forcing. Note that $\mathbb{I}$ is σ -linked (two conditions with the same initial segment and sets of functions which agree long enough are compatible by (iv)). Also both eventually different reals forcing $\mathbb{E}$ and localization forcing $\mathbb{L}$ are inflexible (for both, let $B_\ell = \omega$, $\omega = \bigcup_{k \in \omega} C_k$ any partition into infinitely many infinite pieces, and $n_\ell = \ell$; for $\mathbb{E}$, $A_\ell = \omega$, $C_{k,\ell} = C_k$, and $R_\ell = \emptyset$; for $\mathbb{L}$, $A_\ell = [\omega]^{\ell+1}$, $C_{k,\ell} = \{a \in A_\ell; \max(a) \in C_k\}$, and $R_\ell = \supseteq$).

2.1. Theorem. *An inflexible forcing $\mathbb{I}$ adds a Luzin set of size 2^ω .*

PROOF. Let $\{f_{\alpha,m,i}; \alpha \in 2^\omega \wedge m \in \omega \wedge i \in n_m\} \subseteq \prod_{i \in \omega} B_i$ be a family of almost disjoint functions (i.e. $(\alpha, \ell, i) \neq (\beta, m, j)$ implies $\forall^\infty n (f_{\alpha,\ell,i}(n) \neq f_{\beta,m,j}(n))$) — such a family is constructed like an a.d. family of size 2^ω). We shall define a sequence $\langle \check{f}_\alpha; \alpha \in 2^\omega \rangle$ of $\mathbb{I}$ -names for objects in ω^ω .

Fix $\alpha \in 2^\omega$ and $m \in \omega$. Note that

$$D_{\alpha,m} := \{(\sigma, \{f_{\alpha,m,i}; i \in n_m\}); \exists \ell \geq m (\sigma \in \prod_{i \in \ell} A_i \wedge (\ell > m \longrightarrow \neg(\sigma(\ell-1) R_{\ell-1} \{f_{\alpha,m,i}(\ell-1); i \in n_m\})))\}$$

is a maximal antichain in $\mathbb{I}$. For $(\sigma, \{f_{\alpha,m,i}; i \in n_m\}) \in D_{\alpha,m}$, we set

$$(\sigma, \{f_{\alpha,m,i}; i \in n_m\}) \Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{f}_\alpha(m) = \ell'' \longleftrightarrow \begin{cases} lh(\sigma) \geq 2 \text{ and } \sigma(lh(\sigma) - 2) \in C_{\ell, lh(\sigma) - 2} & \text{or} \\ lh(\sigma) < 2 \text{ and } \ell = 0. \end{cases}$$

This completes the definition of the sequence of names $\langle \check{f}_\alpha; \alpha < 2^\omega \rangle$.

Next let $\check{T}$ be an $\mathbb{I}$ -name so that

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{T} \subseteq \omega^{<\omega} \text{ is a nowhere dense tree}.$$

This means that given $s \in \omega^{<\omega}$ we have an $\mathbb{I}$ -name $\check{t}_s$ so that

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} s \subseteq \check{t}_s \text{ and } \check{t}_s \notin \check{T}.$$

Let $I_s := \{(\sigma_s^n, G_s^n); n \in \omega\}$ be a maximal antichain of conditions deciding $\check{t}_s$. We say $\alpha \in 2^\omega$ is (m, s, n) -bad iff

$$\forall^\infty i \in \omega (|\{f_{\alpha,m,j}(i); j \in n_m\} \setminus \{g(i); g \in G_s^n\}| \leq \frac{n_m}{2}).$$

By almost-disjointness of the functions $f_{\alpha,m,j}$ only finitely many α can be (m, s, n) -bad. Let $\mathcal{A} := \{\alpha; \exists (m, s, n) \in \omega \times \omega^{<\omega} \times \omega (\alpha \text{ is } (m, s, n)\text{-bad})\}$. $\mathcal{A}$ is an at most countable subset of 2^ω . To finish the proof of Theorem 2.1. it suffices to show:

2.2. Claim. *For all $\alpha \in 2^\omega \setminus \mathcal{A}$, $\Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{f}_\alpha \notin \check{T}$.*

PROOF OF CLAIM. Suppose, by way of contradiction, that there are $\alpha \in 2^\omega \setminus \mathcal{A}$ and $(\sigma, G) \in \mathbb{I}$ so that

$$(\sigma, G) \Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{f}_\alpha \in \check{T}''.$$

Choose $m \in \omega$ so that $|G| < \frac{n_m}{2}$. Let $G' := G \cup \{f_{\alpha, \ell, i}; \ell < m \wedge i \in n_\ell\}$. Extending σ , if necessary, we may assume that (σ, G') decides $\check{f}_\alpha \restriction m$, say $(\sigma, G') \Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{f}_\alpha \restriction m = s''$. For some $n \in \omega$, (σ, G') and (σ_s^n, G_s^n) are compatible with common extension (τ, G'') ; without loss G'' is of the form $G'' = G' \cup G_s^n$ (cf (ii) in the definition of inflexibility). Let $t \in \omega^{<\omega}$ be such that $(\sigma_s^n, G_s^n) \Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{t}_s = t''$. Set $m' := lh(t)$; without loss $m' > m$ (otherwise we are done).

For $m' > \ell \geq m$ we recursively choose i_ℓ so that

- 1) $i_\ell \geq i_{\ell-1} + 2$ (where $i_{m-1} + 1 = lh(\tau)$) and $i_\ell \geq \ell$;
- 2) $|\{f_{\alpha, \ell, j}(i_\ell); j \in n_\ell\} \setminus \{g(i_\ell); g \in G_s^n\}| > \frac{n_\ell}{2}$;
- 3) $\{f_{\alpha, \ell, j}(i_\ell); j \in n_\ell\} \cap \{f_{\alpha, \ell', j}(i_\ell); \ell' < \ell \wedge j \in n_{\ell'}\} = \emptyset$;
- 4) $t(\ell) < m_{i_\ell-1}$;
- 5) $n_{i_\ell+1} \geq |G''| + \sum_{\ell \geq \ell' \geq m} n_{\ell'}$.

Note that 2) is possible because $\alpha \notin \mathcal{A}$ (the other conditions can be trivially satisfied by choosing i_ℓ large enough). Next, again by recursion on $m' > \ell \geq m$ we extend τ to τ_ℓ of length $i_\ell + 1$ so that

- a) $\tau \subseteq \tau_{\ell-1} \subseteq \tau_\ell$ (where $\tau_{m-1} = \tau$);
- b) $\forall i (i_{\ell-1} + 1 \leq i \leq i_\ell \longrightarrow (\tau_\ell(i) R_i(\{g(i); g \in G''\} \cup \{f_{\alpha, \ell', j}(i); \ell' < \ell \wedge j \in n_{\ell'}\})))$;
- c) $\tau_\ell(i_\ell - 1) \in C_{t(\ell), i_\ell-1}$;
- d) $\neg(\tau_\ell(i_\ell) R_{i_\ell} \{f_{\alpha, \ell, j}(i_\ell); j \in n_\ell\})$.

This is possible by (iii) and (iv) in the definition of inflexibility. But $(\tau_{m'-1}, G'' \cup \{f_{\alpha, \ell, j}; \ell < m' \wedge j \in n_\ell\}) \leq (\tau, G'') \leq (\sigma, G)$ and

$$(\tau_{m'-1}, G'' \cup \{f_{\alpha, \ell, j}; \ell < m' \wedge j \in n_\ell\}) \Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{f}_\alpha \restriction m' = t = \check{t}_s \notin \check{T}'',$$

a contradiction. $\square \square$

Since the following result is proved by a combination of the methods of the proof of 2.1. and the one of [BJS, Theorem 2.2.], we merely sketch the argument.

2.3. Theorem. *An inflexible forcing $\mathbb{I}$ adjoins a mad family of size ω_1 .*

PROOF. We start with an easy observation from [BJS, 2.2.].

2.4. Observation. Let $\langle N_\alpha; \omega \leq \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$, $\langle h_\alpha; \omega \leq \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ and $\langle r_\alpha; \omega \leq \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ be sequences such that $N_\alpha \prec H(\chi)$ is countable and $N_\alpha \prec N_\beta$ for $\alpha < \beta$, $h_\alpha \in \omega^\omega \cap N_\alpha$ is one-to-one and onto, $r_\alpha \in \omega^\omega$ is Cohen over N_α and $\langle r_\alpha; \alpha < \beta \rangle \in N_\beta$. Define recursively sets C_α for $\alpha < \omega_1$. $\langle C_n; n \in \omega \rangle$ is a partition of ω into countable pieces lying in N_ω . For $\alpha \geq \omega$, $C_\alpha := \{r_\alpha(n); n \in \omega \wedge \forall m < n (r_\alpha(n) \notin C_{h_\alpha(m)})\}$. Then $\{C_\alpha; \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ is an a. d. family. $\square$

As in the proof of 2.1., we let $\{f_{\alpha,m,i}; \alpha \in \omega_1 \wedge m \in \omega \wedge i \in n_m\} \subseteq \prod_{i \in \omega} B_i$ be a family of almost disjoint functions; and we define the sequence $\langle \check{f}_\alpha; \alpha \in \omega_1 \rangle$ of $\mathbb{I}$ -names for functions from ω to ω as before. By Theorem 2.1., $\langle \check{f}_\alpha[i]; \alpha \in \omega_1 \rangle$ is Luzin in $V[i]$ (where i is the $\mathbb{I}$ -generic real), and thus we can find (still in $V[i]$) a strictly increasing function $\phi : \omega_1 \setminus \omega \rightarrow \omega_1$ and sequences $\langle N_\alpha; \omega \leq \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$, $\langle h_\alpha; \omega \leq \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ so that for $r_\alpha := \check{f}_{\phi(\alpha)}[i]$ the requirements of 2.4. are satisfied. By *ccc*-ness of $\mathbb{I}$, we may assume that $\phi \in V$; and, in fact, $\phi = id$. Also note that we can suppose that $\langle h_\alpha; \omega \leq \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle \in V$. We shall prove that the resulting family $\langle C_\alpha; \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ is indeed mad.

For suppose not, and let $\check{C}$ be an $\mathbb{I}$ -name so that

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \forall \alpha < \omega_1 (|\check{C}_\alpha \cap \check{C}| < \omega).$$

Let $\check{f}$ be an $\mathbb{I}$ -name for the strictly increasing enumeration of $\check{C}$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1., let $I_m := \{(\sigma_m^n, G_m^n); n \in \omega\}$ be a maximal antichain of conditions deciding $\check{f}(m)$. Next, for $\alpha < \omega_1$, let $\check{k}_\alpha$ be an $\mathbb{I}$ -name for a natural number so that

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{C}_\alpha \cap \check{C} \subseteq \check{k}_\alpha.$$

Let $I'_\alpha := \{(\sigma'_\alpha^n, G'_\alpha^n); n \in \omega\}$ be a maximal antichain of conditions deciding $\check{k}_\alpha$. For $\Gamma \subseteq \omega_1$ finite and $m, m', N \in \omega$ say α is (m, m', Γ, N) -bad iff

$$\forall^\infty i \in \omega (|\{f_{\alpha,m,j}(i); j \in n_m\} \setminus \{g(i); \exists n < N (\exists \beta \in \Gamma (g \in G'_\beta^n) \vee g \in G_{m'}^n)\}| \leq \frac{n_m}{2}).$$

Only finitely many α can be (m, m', Γ, N) -bad. Finally we choose $\alpha < \omega_1$ so that

(♣) if $\Gamma \subseteq \alpha$ and $m, m', N \in \omega$ and β is (m, m', Γ, N) -bad, then $\beta < \alpha$.

Choose $n \in \omega$ arbitrarily, and let $k \in \omega$ be such that $(\sigma'_\alpha^n, G'_\alpha^n) \Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{k}_\alpha = k$. We reach a contradiction by showing:

2.5. Claim. $(\sigma'_\alpha^n, G'_\alpha^n) \nVdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{C}_\alpha \cap \check{C} \subseteq k$.

PROOF OF CLAIM. Choose $m \in \omega$ so that $|G'_\alpha^n| < \frac{n_m}{2}$. Let $G' := G'_\alpha^n \cup \{f_{\alpha,\ell,i}; \ell < m \wedge i \in n_\ell\}$. Extend σ'_α^n to σ , if necessary, so that $(\sigma, G') \leq (\sigma'_\alpha^n, G'_\alpha^n)$ is a condition and

decides $\check{f}_\alpha \restriction m$, say $(\sigma, G') \Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{f}_\alpha \restriction m = s''$. Let $\Gamma := \{h_\alpha(\ell); \ell < m\}$; for each $\beta \in \Gamma$ find (recursively) $n_\beta \in \omega$ so that $\{(\sigma_\beta^{n_\beta}, G_\beta^{n_\beta}); \beta \in \Gamma\} \cup \{(\sigma, G')\}$ has a common extension, say (τ, G'') ; let $k_\beta \in \omega$ be so that $(\sigma_\beta^{n_\beta}, G_\beta^{n_\beta}) \Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{k}_\beta = k_\beta''$. Let m' be larger than the maximum of the k_β and k . Find $n' \in \omega$ so that (τ, G'') and $(\sigma_{m'}^{n'}, G_{m'}^{n'})$ have a common extension, say (τ', G''') ; without loss G''' is of the form $G''' = G' \cup \bigcup_{\beta \in \Gamma} G_\beta^{n_\beta} \cup G_{m'}^{n'}$; let $\tilde{\ell} \in \omega$ be such that $(\sigma_{m'}^{n'}, G_{m'}^{n'}) \Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{f}(m') = \tilde{\ell}$. As $\check{f}$ is an $\mathbb{I}$ -name for a strictly increasing function, $\tilde{\ell} \geq m' \geq k$.

Using an argument similar to the final argument in the proof of Claim 2.2. (applying that α is not (m, m', Γ, N) -bad where N is larger than the maximum of the n_β and n' ($\clubsuit$)) we can find $(\tau'', G''' \cup \{f_{\alpha, m, i}; i \in n_m\}) \leq (\tau', G''') \leq (\sigma_\alpha^{n'}, G_\alpha^{n'})$ so that

$$(\tau'', G''' \cup \{f_{\alpha, m, i}; i \in n_m\}) \Vdash_{\mathbb{I}} \check{f}_\alpha(m) = \tilde{\ell} = \check{f}(m') \in (\check{C} \cap \check{C}_\alpha) \setminus k'',$$

a contradiction (note that $\check{f}_\alpha(m)$ is forced to belong to $\check{C}_\alpha$, because a weaker condition forces it not to belong to any $\check{C}_{h_\alpha(\ell)}$, $\ell < m$, see 2.4.). $\square \square$

As the corresponding result in section 2 of [BJS], Theorem 2.1. has consequences concerning the values of the invariants in Cichoń's diagram after adding a real via an inflexible forcing notion.

2.6. Corollary. (a) *Let $\mathbb{I} \in V$ be inflexible; then $V^{\mathbb{I}} \models \text{"unif}(\mathcal{M}) = \omega_1 \text{ and } \text{cov}(\mathcal{M}) = 2^\omega\text{"}$. Thus the invariants on the left-hand side in Cichoń's diagram all equal ω_1 , whereas those on the right-hand side are equal to 2^ω in $V[i]$. Furthermore, $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{a} = \omega_1$ and $\mathbf{r} = 2^\omega$ in $V[i]$.*

(b) *In particular, after adding an eventually different real e or a localization real ℓ , $\text{unif}(\mathcal{M}) = \omega_1$ and $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M}) = 2^\omega$ in $V[e]$ (or $V[\ell]$, respectively). $\square$*

Part (b) improves earlier partial results in [Br 2, § 1].

We note that our definition of *inflexible* is general enough to provide us with the same results for the forcings adding an eventually different or a localization real below a given function $g \in \omega^\omega$ converging to infinity (in case of localization, this forcing has been considered by Pawlikowski, see [Pa 1, section 2] for details).

We close this section with some comments concerning the structure of inflexible forcing notions. We say a p.o. $\mathbb{P}$ has (κ, ω) -caliber iff for every $A \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ of size κ there is a countable $B \subseteq A$ and a $p \in \mathbb{P}$ with $\forall q \in B (p \leq q)$. This notion is implicit in [Tr 2] (see also [Br

2, section 1]). Using an argument with almost disjoint functions as before we see that an inflexible forcing $\mathbb{I}$ does not have $(2^\omega, \omega)$ -caliber. This suggests that we ask:

2.7. Question. *Assume $\mathbb{P}$ is a ccc forcing notion generated by a name for a real of size κ , $\kappa \leq 2^\omega$, which does not have (κ, ω) -caliber. Does this imply that $\mathbb{P}$ adjoins a Luzin set of size κ ?*

We note that we cannot drop any of our hypotheses. We shall see non-ccc counterexamples in the next section; the algebra $\mathbb{B}_\kappa$ adding κ random reals is a counterexample (it adds a Sierpiński set [i.e. an uncountable set of reals which has at most countable intersection with every null set], but not a Luzin set, of size κ), which is not generated by a name for a real; finally the random algebra $\mathbb{B}$ itself is a counterexample having $(2^\omega, \omega)$ -caliber.

3. Variation — adjoining small dominating families

This section is dedicated to the investigation of several proper forcing notions which add a dominating real like Mathias and Laver forcing.

We say a forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ is *Laver-like* iff $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_{\check{r}}$ where $\check{r}$ is a $\mathbb{P}$ -name for a dominating real and given $p \in \mathbb{P}$ there is a Laver tree $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ so that $\forall \sigma \in T$ ($p(T_\sigma) := \bigcap_{n \in \omega} \bigcup_{\tau \in T_\sigma, lh(\tau)=n} (p \cap \llbracket \check{r} \restriction lh(\tau) = \tau \rrbracket) \in r.o.(\mathbb{P}) \setminus \{0\}$) [we usually express this in a somewhat sloppy way by saying $p(T) \neq 0$ where $p(T) = p(T_{stem(T)})$]. Note that all forcings adding a dominating real which we have encountered so far have this property. Following Judah and Shelah ([JS 1, 1.5.] and [JS 2, 1.9.]), for a Laver tree T , we say $A \subseteq T$ is a *front* iff $\sigma \neq \tau$ in A implies $\sigma \not\subseteq \tau$ and for all $f \in [T]$ there is $n \in \omega$ so that $f \restriction n \in A$. We say a Laver-like $\mathbb{P}$ has *strong fusion* iff given countably many open dense sets $D_n \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ and $p \in \mathbb{P}$, there is a Laver tree T so that $p(T) \neq 0$ and for each n , $\{\sigma \in T; p(T) \cap \llbracket \check{r} \restriction lh(\sigma) = \sigma \rrbracket \in D_n\}$ contains a front. Finally, a Laver-like $\mathbb{P}$ is *closed under finite changes* iff given $p \in \mathbb{P}$, Laver trees T and $T' \subseteq T$ so that for all $\sigma \in T'$ ($|succ_T(\sigma) \setminus succ_{T'}(\sigma)| < \omega$), if $p(T) \neq 0$, then $p(T') \neq 0$. We call $\mathbb{F}$ a *flexible* forcing notion iff $\mathbb{F}$ is Laver-like, has strong fusion and is closed under finite changes.

3.1. Theorem. *A flexible forcing $\mathbb{F}$ adds a dominating family of size ω_1 .*

PROOF. We start by creating names for dominating functions. Fix $\alpha \in \omega_1$. We define the tree $T_\alpha \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ and the function $\rho_\alpha : T_\alpha \rightarrow \alpha + 1$ by recursion on the levels.

- ⊙ $\langle \rangle \in T_\alpha$, $\rho_\alpha(\langle \rangle) = \alpha$.
- ⊙ Assume $\sigma \in T_\alpha$, $\alpha \geq \rho_\alpha(\sigma) > 0$. Then $\forall n$ ($\sigma^\frown \langle n \rangle \in T_\alpha$). If $\rho_\alpha(\sigma) = \beta + 1$ is a successor, $\forall n$ ($\rho_\alpha(\sigma^\frown \langle n \rangle) = \beta$). If $\rho_\alpha(\sigma)$ is a limit choose a strictly increasing sequence $\langle \beta_n; n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $\rho_\alpha(\sigma) = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \beta_n$, and let $\forall n$ ($\rho_\alpha(\sigma^\frown \langle n \rangle) = \beta_n$).
- ⊙ Assume $\sigma \in T_\alpha$, $\rho_\alpha(\sigma) = 0$. Then $\forall n$ ($\sigma^\frown \langle n \rangle \notin T_\alpha$).

This concludes the definition of T_α and ρ_α . It is immediate that T_α has no infinite branches, and that ρ_α is the canonical rank function witnessing this.

Next we recursively introduce a sequence $\langle \rho_\alpha^n; n \in \omega \rangle$ of functions defined on subsets of $\omega^{<\omega}$:

- $\text{dom} \rho_\alpha^0 = \omega^{<\omega}$,

$$\rho_\alpha^0(\sigma) = \begin{cases} \rho_\alpha(\sigma) & \text{if } \sigma \in T_\alpha \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- $\text{dom} \rho_\alpha^n = \{\sigma; \rho_\alpha^{n-1}(\sigma) = 0\}$, for $\sigma \in \text{dom} \rho_\alpha^n$ choose $m \in \omega$ minimal such that $\rho_\alpha^{n-1}(\sigma \upharpoonright m) = 0$ and assume $\sigma = \sigma \upharpoonright m \frown \tau$. Then

$$\rho_\alpha^n(\sigma) = \begin{cases} \rho_\alpha(\tau) & \text{if } \tau \in T_\alpha \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(Note $\rho_\alpha^n(\sigma) = \alpha \iff \tau = \langle \rangle \iff m = lh(\sigma)$.)

This concludes the definition of $\langle \rho_\alpha^n; n \in \omega \rangle$. Now it is easy to define an $\mathbb{F}$ -name $\check{f}_\alpha$ for a function in ω^ω as follows: $p \in \mathbb{F}$ decides the value $\check{f}_\alpha(n)$ iff there is $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$ so that $p \leq \llbracket \check{r} \upharpoonright lh(\sigma) = \sigma \rrbracket$ and $\rho_\alpha^n(\sigma) = 0$; in this case let $m \in \omega$ be minimal so that $\rho_\alpha^n(\sigma \upharpoonright m) = 0$; then we say

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{F}} \check{f}_\alpha(n) = \sigma(m-1).$$

3.2. Claim. $\Vdash_{\mathbb{F}} \{\check{f}_\alpha; \alpha < \omega_1\}$ is a dominating family.

PROOF OF CLAIM. Let $\check{g}$ be an $\mathbb{F}$ -name for a function from ω to ω . Let $D_n = \{p \in \mathbb{F}; p \text{ decides } \check{g}(n)\}$. Given $p \in \mathbb{F}$, apply strong fusion to get a Laver tree T so that $p \geq p(T) \neq 0$ and for each n , $\{\sigma \in T; p(T) \cap \llbracket \check{r} \upharpoonright lh(\sigma) = \sigma \rrbracket \in D_n\}$ contains a front $(*)$. For $n \in \omega$ we define a function $rk_n : T \rightarrow \omega_1$ by recursion on the ordinals as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} rk_n(\eta) &= 0 \iff p(T) \cap \llbracket \check{r} \upharpoonright lh(\eta) = \eta \rrbracket \in D_n \\ rk_n(\eta) &= \sup\{rk_n(\eta^\frown \langle m \rangle) + 1; \eta^\frown \langle m \rangle \in T\} \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (*) above that rk_n is defined on all of T . Let $\tilde{\alpha} := \sup\{rk_n(\langle \rangle) + 1; n \in \omega\}$.

3.3. Subclaim. $p(T) \Vdash_{\mathbb{F}} \forall \alpha \geq \tilde{\alpha} \forall^\infty n (\check{f}_\alpha(n) > \check{g}(n))$.

PROOF OF SUBCLAIM. Choose $\alpha \geq \tilde{\alpha}$ and a condition $q \leq p(T)$; without loss q is of the form $q(S)$ for some Laver tree $S \subseteq T$. Let $\sigma = \text{stem}(S)$. Let n be minimal so that either $\rho_\alpha^n(\sigma) = \alpha$ or $\sigma \notin \text{dom} \rho_\alpha^n$. Extending σ if necessary, we can assume that the former case holds. We construct by recursion on the levels $S' \subseteq S$ with $\text{stem}(S') = \sigma$ so that for all $\tau \in S'$ ($|\text{succ}_S(\tau) \setminus \text{succ}_{S'}(\tau)| < \omega$) and

$$q(S') \Vdash_{\mathbb{F}} \forall m \geq n (\check{f}_\alpha(m) > \check{g}(m)). \quad (**)$$

(Note that $q(S') \neq 0$ by closure under finite changes.) We guarantee along the construction that if $\tau \in S'$ then for all $m \geq n$ either $0 \leq rk_m(\tau) < \rho_\alpha^m(\tau)$ or $(0 = rk_m(\tau) = \rho_\alpha^m(\tau)$ and some $\ell_1 < \ell_2 \leq lh(\tau)$ are minimal with $rk_m(\tau \restriction \ell_1) = 0$ and $\rho_\alpha^m(\tau \restriction \ell_2) = 0$ and $\tau(\ell_2 - 1) > \ell_3$ where $p(T) \cap \Vdash_{\mathbb{F}} \check{g}(m) = \ell_3$). (this clearly implies (**)).

To do the construction assume we have put $\tau \supseteq \sigma$, $\tau \in S$, into S' . We do not have to care about m 's so that $\rho_\alpha^m(\tau) = 0$. Assume, therefore, that $m \geq n$ is minimal so that $\rho_\alpha^m(\tau) > 0$; then also $\rho_\alpha^m(\tau) > rk_m(\tau)$. In case $\rho_\alpha^m(\tau) = 1 > 0 = rk_m(\tau)$ find $\ell_1 \leq lh(\tau)$ minimal such that $rk_m(\tau \restriction \ell_1) = 0$ and ℓ_3 such that $p(T) \cap \Vdash_{\mathbb{F}} \check{g}(m) = \ell_3$. Put $\tau \hat{\langle} \ell \rangle$ into S' iff $\tau \hat{\langle} \ell \rangle \in S$ and $\ell > \ell_3$. In all other cases $\rho_\alpha^m(\tau \hat{\langle} \ell \rangle) > rk_m(\tau \hat{\langle} \ell \rangle)$ for almost all ℓ such that $\tau \hat{\langle} \ell \rangle \in S$; and we can put these into S' . Finally, we do not have to care about $m' > m$ because $\tau \notin \text{dom} \rho_\alpha^{m'}$. This concludes the construction, the proof of the Subclaim, Claim, and Theorem. $\square \square \square$

We can now determine the effect of adding a Laver real on almost all invariants in Cichoń's diagram under $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$.

3.4. Theorem. *Let $V \models ZFC$. Then*

(a) $V^{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \models \mathbf{d} = \omega_1$.

(b) *If $V \models \text{"}MA(\sigma\text{-centered}) + 2^\omega = \kappa\text{"}$, then $V^{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \models \text{"}unif(\mathcal{L}) = unif(\mathcal{M}) = \kappa = 2^\omega\text{"}$.*

(c) *Assume $V \models GCH$, let κ be regular uncountable, and assume $\langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha, \check{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha; \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ is an iterated forcing construction with finite supports so that*

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha} \text{"}\check{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha \text{ is } \sigma\text{-centered" and}$$

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\kappa} \text{"}MA(\sigma\text{-centered})\text{"}.$$

Then $V^{\mathbb{P}_\kappa \star \mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \models \text{"}unif(\mathcal{L}) = unif(\mathcal{M}) = \kappa = 2^\omega + \mathbf{d} = cov(\mathcal{L}) = \omega_1\text{"}$.

PROOF. (a) To show $\mathbf{d} = \omega_1$, we will apply the previous Theorem. Laver forcing clearly is Laver-like and closed under finite changes, and strong fusion was proved by Judah and Shelah in [JS 2, 1.9.]. We repeat the argument here for completeness' sake.

Take a Laver tree T and $D \subseteq \mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}$ open dense. For each $\sigma \in T$ we define the *rank* of σ , $\rho(\sigma)$, by recursion on the ordinals:

$$\rho(\sigma) = 0 \longleftrightarrow \exists S \leq_0 T_\sigma \ (S \in D).$$

$$\rho(\sigma) = \alpha \longleftrightarrow \text{for no } \beta < \alpha \ (\rho(\sigma) = \beta) \text{ and } \exists^\infty n \ (\sigma^\frown \langle n \rangle \in T \text{ and } \rho(\sigma^\frown \langle n \rangle) < \alpha).$$

If $\rho(\sigma)$ is undefined, we put $\rho(\sigma) = \infty$.

We claim that $\rho(\text{stem}(T)) < \infty$. Otherwise build a condition $T' \leq T$ recursively so that if $\sigma \in T'$ then $\rho(\sigma) = \infty$: $\text{stem}(T) \in T'$; by definition of ρ , almost all successors of $\text{stem}(T)$ in T have rank ∞ ; put them into T' and proceed. In the end choose $S' \leq T'$ so that $S' \in D$. Then $\rho(\text{stem}(S')) = 0$ by definition; but also $\rho(\text{stem}(S')) = \infty$ by construction of T' , a contradiction.

Next, build $T' \leq_0 T$ recursively so that if $\sigma \in T'$ and $\rho(\sigma) > 0$, then for all $n \in \omega$ with $\sigma^\frown \langle n \rangle \in T'$, $\rho(\sigma^\frown \langle n \rangle) < \rho(\sigma)$, and so that if $\sigma \in T'$, $\rho(\sigma) = 0$ and for all $n < lh(\sigma)$ $\rho(\sigma \restriction n) > 0$, then $T'_\sigma \in D$.

This gives a front for one open dense set. For countably many just use one of the standard fusion arguments for Laver forcing.

(b) For the uniformities we have to modify the argument that $\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}$ doesn't collapse cardinals under $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$, due to Judah, Miller and Shelah [JMS, section 3].

Following [JMS, section 3], we let $Q = \{\bar{A} = \langle A_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle; \forall \sigma (A_\sigma \in [\omega]^\omega)\}$. With $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$ and $\bar{A} = \langle A_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle \in Q$ we can associate a condition $T_\sigma = T_\sigma(\bar{A}) \in \mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}$ as follows. $T_\sigma(\bar{A})$ is the unique Laver tree with $\text{stem}(T_\sigma) = \sigma$ and if $\tau \supseteq \sigma$ and $\tau \in T_\sigma$ then $\text{succ}_{T_\sigma}(\tau) = A_\tau$. We put $\bar{A} = \langle A_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle \leq \bar{B} = \langle B_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle$ iff $\forall \sigma (A_\sigma \subseteq B_\sigma)$ iff $\forall \sigma (T_\sigma(\bar{A}) \leq T_\sigma(\bar{B}))$.

Let $\langle I_n; n \in \omega \rangle$ be a partition of ω into finite intervals so that $\max(I_n) + 1 = \min(I_{n+1})$ and $|I_n| \geq n^2$. The following is proved easily using the Laver property and the argument of [JMS, Lemma 3.1.].

3.5. Lemma. *Assume $\Vdash_{-\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \check{f} \in 2^\omega$ and $\bar{B} = \langle B_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle \in Q$. Then there are $\phi_\sigma \in \prod_n [2^{I_n}]^n$ and $\bar{A} = \langle A_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle \leq \bar{B}$ such that for every $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$*

$$T_\sigma(\bar{A}) \Vdash_{-\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \forall n (\check{f} \restriction I_n \in \phi_\sigma(n)).$$

PROOF. We construct A_σ and ϕ_σ by recursion on $lh(\sigma)$.

$\triangleright \sigma = \langle \rangle$. Using a standard fusion argument for Laver forcing, find $T \leq_0 T_{\langle \rangle}(\bar{B})$ and $\phi_{\langle \rangle}$ so that

$$T \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \forall n (\check{f} \restriction I_n \in \phi_{\langle \rangle}(n)).$$

For $\tau \in T$, let $A_\tau = succ_T(\tau)$ and $\phi_\tau = \phi_{\langle \rangle}$.

$\triangleright lh(\sigma) > 0$. Either A_σ and ϕ_σ have been constructed already, or we proceed as before.

□

Next, following Goldstern, Repický, Shelah and Spinas [GRSS, section 1], for $\bar{A}, \bar{B} \in Q$ we write $\bar{A} \leq^* \bar{B}$ iff $\forall \sigma (A_\sigma \subseteq^* B_\sigma)$ and $\forall^\infty \sigma (A_\sigma \subseteq B_\sigma)$. Then:

3.6. Lemma. (Judah – Miller – Shelah) [JMS, section 3] (see also [GRSS, section 1])
Assume $MA_\lambda(\sigma\text{-centered})$. If $\langle \bar{A}^\alpha; \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is a $\leq^$ -descending sequence of elements of Q , then there exists $\bar{A}^\alpha$ such that for all $\alpha < \lambda$, $\bar{A}^\lambda \leq^* \bar{A}^\alpha$. □*

We now have what we need to show that both $unif(\mathcal{L})$ and $unif(\mathcal{M})$ equal $2^\omega = \kappa$ after one Laver real over a model of $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$. Assume $\lambda < \kappa$ and $\langle \check{f}_\alpha; \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is a sequence of $\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}$ -names for objects in 2^ω . Given $T \in \mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}$ we shall produce $S \leq T$ and a set $D \subseteq 2^\omega$ which is a union of countably many closed measure zero sets so that

$$S \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \forall \alpha < \lambda (\check{f}_\alpha \in D).$$

Without loss $T = \omega^{<\omega}$. Using Lemmata 3.5. and 3.6. construct a $\leq^*$ -decreasing sequence $\langle \bar{A}^\alpha; \alpha \leq \lambda \rangle$ of elements of Q and $\langle \phi_\sigma^\alpha \in \prod_n [2^{I_n}]^n; \alpha < \lambda, \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle$ so that for all $\alpha < \lambda$ and $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$,

$$T_\sigma(\bar{A}^\alpha) \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \forall n (\check{f}_\alpha \restriction I_n \in \phi_\sigma^\alpha(n)).$$

Set $D_\sigma^\alpha := \{f \in 2^\omega; \forall n (f \restriction I_n \in \phi_\sigma^\alpha(n))\}$; D_σ^α is a closed null set. Let $D := \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda, \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}} D_\sigma^\alpha$. It is easy to check that

$$T_{\langle \rangle}(\bar{A}^\lambda) \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \forall \alpha < \lambda (\check{f}_\alpha \in D).$$

By a recent result of Bartoszyński and Shelah [BS], the additivity of the σ -ideal generated by the closed null sets equals $add(\mathcal{M})$ and is thus $\geq \mathfrak{p}$. Hence the assumptions on V imply that D is indeed contained in the union of countably many closed null sets.

(c) It remains to show that $cov(\mathcal{L}) = \omega_1$ in the model of part (c) of Theorem 3.4. The proof is modelled on the proof of [Br 1, 1.1., Lemma 1]. Let G_κ be $\mathbb{P}_\kappa$ -generic over V , and

work in $V[G_\kappa]$. Suppose $\check{f}$ is an $\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}$ -name for an element of the Cantor space 2^ω . Given $T \in \mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}$ we shall find $S \leq T$ and a Borel null set $A \in V$ so that

$$(*) \quad S \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \check{f} \in A.$$

Since $V \models GCH$, this is clearly sufficient.

Without loss, $T = \omega^{<\omega}$. Fix $n \in \omega$. Find $\bar{A}^n = \langle A_\sigma^n; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle \in Q$ and $t_\sigma^n \in 2^n$ ($\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$) so that

$$T_\sigma(\bar{A}^n) \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \check{f} \restriction n = t_\sigma^n$$

for all $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$. $\bar{A}^n$ and t_σ^n are easily constructed by recursion on $lh(\sigma)$ (and we refer the reader to similar constructions in 3.5. and 5.2. in case of doubt). Unfix n and find $\bar{A} \in Q$ so that $\bar{A} \leq^* \bar{A}^n$ for all $n \in \omega$ (cf 3.6.). Using König's Lemma for ω -trees find $x_\sigma^n \geq n$ so that $m < n$ implies $t_\sigma^{x_\sigma^m} \restriction m \subseteq t_\sigma^{x_\sigma^n} \restriction n$. Define $f_\sigma \in 2^\omega$ by $f_\sigma(n) := t_\sigma^{x_\sigma^{n+1}}(n)$.

Because $\mathbb{P}_\kappa$ is a finite-support iteration of σ -centered p.o.'s, there are no reals random over V in $V[G_\kappa]$ (this was proved by Miller, and is implicit in [Mi 1, section 5]; for an explicit argument, see, e.g., [Br 1, subsection 1.1.]). Thus there are measure-zero sets $A_\sigma \in V$ ($\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$) so that $f_\sigma \in A_\sigma$. By *ccc*-ness of $\mathbb{P}_\kappa$, the union of the A_σ (in $V[G_\kappa]$) is contained in a countable union of null sets in V ; call this union A ; clearly A is null. Working still in V find compact trees T_n ($n \in \omega$) so that $A \subseteq 2^\omega \setminus \bigcup_n [T_n]$. We claim that (in $V[G_\kappa]$)

$$T_\emptyset(\bar{A}) \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \check{f} \in 2^\omega \setminus \bigcup_n [T_n],$$

thus proving (*).

For suppose not. Find $S \leq T_\emptyset(\bar{A})$ and $n \in \omega$ so that $S \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \check{f} \in [T_n]$. Let $\sigma := stem(S)$. As $f_\sigma \notin [T_n]$, find $m \in \omega$ so that $t_\sigma^{x_\sigma^m} \restriction m = f_\sigma \restriction m \notin T_n$; i.e. $t_\sigma^{x_\sigma^m} \notin T_n$. Clearly $S \leq T_\sigma(\bar{A})$, and, throwing out finitely many sequences (and their extensions), if necessary, we may assume $S \leq T_\sigma(\bar{A}^{x_\sigma^m})$. Thus

$$S \Vdash_{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \check{f} \restriction x_\sigma^m = t_\sigma^{x_\sigma^m} \notin T_n,$$

a contradiction.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.4. $\square$

We continue with some comments on 3.4.: by (c) it is consistent that $cov(\mathcal{L}) = \omega_1$ after one Laver real over a model for $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$. However, we do not know whether this is always the case. We think, though, that the following question has a positive answer.

3.7. Question. Assume $V \models "MA + 2^\omega = \kappa"$. Does $V^{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \models "cov(\mathcal{L}) = \kappa"$?

We shall comment on this again at the end of section 5. Concerning the cardinals which do not figure in Cichoń's diagram we get $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{s} = \omega_1$ after adding a Laver real. Closely related to Question 3.7. is:

3.8. Question. Assume $V \models "MA(\sigma\text{-centered}) + 2^\omega = \kappa"$. Does $V^{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}} \models "\mathbf{r} = 2^\omega"$?

Finally we do not know the answer to the following.

3.9. Question. Is $\mathbf{a} = \omega_1$ after one Laver real?

We conjecture the answer is yes; in fact, it is an open problem whether $\mathbf{d} < \mathbf{a}$ is consistent at all.

Classically the consistency of $unif(\mathcal{L}) = unif(\mathcal{M}) = 2^\omega > \mathbf{d} = cov(\mathcal{L}) = \omega_1$ was shown by Bartoszyński, Judah and Shelah [BaJS, section 3] by iterating Shelah $(\mathbb{Q}_{f,g})$ reals and infinitely often equal reals. This proof works only in case $2^\omega = \omega_2$. In so far our result in Theorem 3.4. (c) is more general — it allows the continuum to be of arbitrary regular uncountable size. This partially answers an instance of Question 1 in [Br 1]. We believe it is an interesting line of research to figure out whether other consistency results in Cichoń's diagram can be gotten in a similar fashion.

We next discuss several other forcing notions introduced in section 1.

3.10. Corollary. (a) Let $\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{U}}$ be Laver forcing with an ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$. Then $V^{\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{U}}} \models \mathbf{d} = \omega_1$.

(b) Let $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}$ be Mathias forcing with a Ramsey ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$. Then $V^{\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}} \models \mathbf{d} = \omega_1$.

(c) Let $\mathbb{M}$ be Mathias forcing. Then $V^{\mathbb{M}} \models \mathbf{d} = \omega_1$.

(d) Both $\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A} \star \check{\mathbb{L}}\mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{M} \star \check{\mathbb{M}}$ (the two-step iterations) force CH (and even $\diamond$).

PROOF. (a) $\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is trivially Laver-like and closed under finite changes. Strong fusion is proved in a similar fashion as for $\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}$ (see the proof of Theorem 3.4., part (a); or see the original proof in [JS 1, Lemma 1.6.]).

(b) Immediate from $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}} \cong \mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{U}}$ (see 1.1.).

(c) Immediate from $\mathbb{M} \cong P(\omega)/fin \star \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{U}}$ (see 1.1.).

(d) CH is immediate from 3.4. (a) ((c), respectively) and the fact that $\mathbb{L}\mathbb{A}$ collapses the continuum below $\mathbf{h} \leq \mathbf{d}$ [GRSS, Theorem 2.7.] (that Mathias forcing collapses the continuum onto $\mathbf{h}$, respectively).

In the absence of CH (in the ground model), $\diamond$ follows from a result of Shelah's [RS]. If CH holds, however, then $\mathbb{LA}$ and $\mathbb{M}$ can be shown to force $\diamond$ by an argument similar to the one for Sacks forcing, due to Carlson and Laver [CL]. $\square$

For Mathias forcing we can show similar results as in Theorem 3.4.; more explicitly, after one Mathias real over a model for $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$, $unif(\mathcal{L}) = unif(\mathcal{M}) = 2^\omega$. Questions 3.7., 3.8. and 3.9. are open for Mathias forcing as well.

All forcing notions generated by a name for a dominating real we have seen in sections 2 and 3 (as well as in [BJS]) add an unbounded family of reals of size ω_1 . Accordingly we ask:

3.11. Question. *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a proper forcing notion generated by a name for a dominating real. Does $V^\mathbb{P} \models \mathfrak{b} = \omega_1$?*

An earlier version of this paper contained the same question without the adjective "proper". Since then Saharon Shelah has noted that a slight modification of the proofs in [SW] gives (non-proper) counterexamples.

Finally note that although both Theorem 2.1. and Theorem 3.1. say that adding a real can have strong combinatorial consequences and collapse many invariants, they are mutually exclusive (as can be seen from the effect on Cichoń's diagram): a Luzin set of size 2^ω entails that every dominating family has size 2^ω as well.

4. Entr'acte — Mathias-absoluteness and the projective Ramsey-property

We leave our combinatorial considerations for a while to deal with consequences of the main result of the last section (for Mathias forcing) to descriptive set theory.

A subset $A \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is called *Ramsey* iff there is $a \in [\omega]^\omega$ so that $[a]^\omega \subseteq A$ or $[a]^\omega \subseteq [\omega]^\omega \setminus A$. A classical result of Silver's says that analytic (Σ_1^1) sets are Ramsey [Si]. Following Judah [Ju 2, section 2], given a universe of set theory V and a forcing notion $\mathbb{P} \in V$, we say that V is $\Sigma_n^1 - \mathbb{P}$ -*absolute* iff for every Σ_n^1 -sentence ϕ with parameters in V , we have $V \models \phi$ iff $V^\mathbb{P} \models \phi$. By Shoenfield's absoluteness Lemma [Je 1, Theorem 98], V is always

$\Sigma_2^1 - \mathbb{P}$ -absolute. Recently Halbeisen [Ha] proved that $\Sigma_3^1 - \mathbb{M}$ -absoluteness is equivalent to *all Σ_2^1 -sets are Ramsey*. We shall show that at least one implication is still true one level higher in the projective hierarchy.

4.1. Theorem. $\Sigma_4^1 - \mathbb{M}$ -absoluteness implies that all Σ_3^1 -sets are Ramsey.

Roughly our argument follows the lines of the proof that Σ_4^1 -Amoeba-absoluteness implies Σ_3^1 -measurability [Br 2, section 2] — still we are indebted to Haim Judah who taught us many of the arguments involved and to Lorenz Halbeisen from whose talk at the Berlin conference on Cantor's Set Theory we learned as well. Before starting the proof itself, we shall give some auxiliary results which might be of own interest.

4.2. Proposition. Assume $\omega_1^{L[r]} = \omega_1^V$, where $r \in \omega^\omega$. Then the reals of $L[r][m]$ dominate the reals of $V[m]$, where m is Mathias ($\mathbb{M}$ -generic) over V .

REMARK. Note that, in general, m is *not* Mathias over $L[r]$.

PROOF. Just note that the $\mathbb{M}$ -names $\check{f}_\alpha$ ($\alpha < \omega_1$) set up at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 3.1. can all be defined within $L[r]$. Therefore their interpretation $\check{f}_\alpha[m]$ lies in $L[r][m]$. The proposition now follows from the fact that they form a dominating family in $V[m]$. $\square$

4.3. Proposition. $\Sigma_4^1 - \mathbb{M}$ -absoluteness implies that $\omega_1^{L[r]} < \omega_1^V$ for all reals r .

PROOF. The proof follows the lines of the proof of [BJS, Theorem 2.6.]. Suppose, by way of contradiction, that there is an $r \in \omega^\omega$ so that $\omega_1^{L[r]} = \omega_1^V$. $\Sigma_3^1 - \mathbb{M}$ -absoluteness implies — by Halbeisen's result quoted at the beginning of this section — that the Σ_2^1 -Ramsey property holds: thus, by [Ju 1, Theorem 0.9.(b)], there are dominating reals over all $L[s]$, where $s \in \omega^\omega$. I.e.

$$V \models \forall s \in \omega^\omega \exists t \in \omega^\omega \forall u \in \omega^\omega (u \notin L[s] \vee \exists n \forall m \geq n (t(m) \geq u(m))),$$

which is a Π_4^1 -statement. By $\Sigma_4^1 - \mathbb{M}$ -absoluteness, it should hold in $V[m]$. By the previous Proposition, however, it is false for $s = \langle r, m \rangle$, a contradiction. $\square$

In a sense the proof of 4.1. splits into two parts. the first is 4.3., the second, given below, is the argument showing that $\Sigma_4^1 - \mathbb{M}$ -absoluteness + $\forall r (\omega_1^{L[r]} < \omega_1)$ entails the Σ_3^1 -Ramsey property. After having figured out the latter part (as presented below), Haim

Judah informed us that he had proved that independently (as a consequence of a general result about Souslin proper forcing notions).

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.1. Let $\phi(x)$ be a Σ_3^1 -formula. First assume that $V[m] \models \neg\phi(m)$, where m is $\mathbb{M}$ -generic over V . By a well-known result of Mathias [Ma, 2.9. and 4.12.], there is $S \in [\omega]^\omega$ so that $(\langle \rangle, S) \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \neg\phi(\check{m})$, and $m \subseteq S$. As subsets of Mathias-generics are again Mathias-generic [Ma, 4.10.], and $m' \subseteq m$ implies (trivially) $m' \subseteq S$, we must have that $V[m] \models \forall m' \in [m]^\omega (\neg\phi(m'))$; i.e. $V[m] \models \exists x \forall y \in [x]^\omega (\neg\phi(y))$. By Σ_4^1 - $\mathbb{M}$ -absoluteness, this must hold in V as well, and we are done.

So assume $V[m] \models \phi(m)$. Write $\mathbb{M} = P(\omega)/fin \star \mathbb{M}_{\check{\mathcal{U}}}$, where $\check{\mathcal{U}}$ is the $P(\omega)/fin$ -name for the generic Ramsey-ultrafilter (see 1.1.). Now note that given $S \in P(\omega)/fin$ and $r \in \omega^\omega$ there is $T \subseteq^* S$ so that $T \Vdash_{P(\omega)/fin} \check{\mathcal{U}} \cap L[r][S]$ is $P(\omega)/fin$ -generic over $L[r][S]$. To see this recall that by the previous Proposition, $(P(\omega)/fin)^{L[r][S]}$ is countable (in the sense of V), and only countably many maximal antichains of $(P(\omega)/fin)^{L[r][S]}$ lie in $L[r][S]$. Hence we can find $T \subseteq^* S$ which is almost included in one member of each of the antichains. In fact, we can now define $\bar{\mathcal{U}} := \{S' \in P(\omega) \cap L[r][S]; T \subseteq^* S'\}$ in V , and $\bar{\mathcal{U}}$ is a Ramsey ultrafilter in $L[r][S][\bar{\mathcal{U}}]$ (by genericity there are no new reals in $L[r][S][\bar{\mathcal{U}}]$).

Let $\phi(x) = \exists y \psi(y, x)$, where ψ is Π_2^1 . Then $V[m] \models \psi(\check{s}[m], m)$ for some $\mathbb{M}_{\check{\mathcal{U}}}$ -name $\check{s}$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is the generic Ramsey ultrafilter. Let r code $\check{s}$ as well as the parameters of ψ . By the previous paragraph and a density argument we can find $S \in P(\omega)/fin \cap V$ so that $\bar{\mathcal{U}} := \mathcal{U} \cap L[r][S]$ is a Ramsey ultrafilter in $L[r][S][\bar{\mathcal{U}}]$ (and $S \in \mathcal{U}$). By a characterization of $\mathbb{M}_{\check{\mathcal{U}}}$ -genericity due to Mathias ([Ma, 2.0.], see also [JS 1, Theorem 1.19]), m must be $\mathbb{M}_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}}$ -generic over $L[r][S][\bar{\mathcal{U}}]$. By Shoenfield's absoluteness Lemma, $L[r][S][\bar{\mathcal{U}}][m] \models \psi(\check{s}[m], m)$. Hence there is $T \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}$ so that

$$L[r][S][\bar{\mathcal{U}}] \models (\langle \rangle, T) \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}}} \psi(\check{s}, \check{m}).$$

Recall that $L[r][S][\bar{\mathcal{U}}] \subseteq V$, and $\bar{\mathcal{U}}$ is a real in the sense of V ; so the previous Proposition applies again, and we get an $\mathbb{M}_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}}$ -generic (over $L[r][S][\bar{\mathcal{U}}]$) m in V with $m \subseteq T$; thus

$$V \models \psi(\check{s}[m], m)$$

and for all $m' \subseteq m$, $V \models \psi(\check{s}[m'], m')$ (by the argument of the first paragraph: subsets of generics are generic). Hence $V \models \forall m' \in [m]^\omega (\phi(m'))$, and we are done. $\square$

5. Counterpoint — preserving $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$

The following result shows that Miller's rational perfect set forcing $\mathbb{MII}$ behaves rather differently from Laver and Mathias forcings.

5.1. Theorem. *Miller forcing preserves the axiom $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$; i.e. if κ is regular uncountable and $V \models "2^\omega = \kappa \wedge MA(\sigma\text{-centered})"$, then $V^{\mathbb{MII}} \models "2^\omega = \kappa \wedge MA(\sigma\text{-centered})"$.*

PROOF. It was proved by Judah, Miller and Shelah in [JMS, Theorem 4.1.] that $\mathbb{MII}$ doesn't collapse cardinals under the assumptions. One main ingredient of our argument is the method of their proof, as corrected by Goldstern, Johnson and Spinas in [GJS, section 4] (note the similarity between some arguments here and in the proof of Theorem 3.4.). We start with setting up some notation which is close to the one in the latter work. The proof then will be broken up into a series of lemmata.

Following [GJS, 4.3.] we call a sequence $\bar{P} = \langle P_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle$ *good* iff each $P_\sigma \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ is infinite, $\tau \in P_\sigma$ implies $\sigma \subset \tau$, and for $\sigma \in \omega^n$, if $\tau, \tau' \in P_\sigma$ and $\tau \neq \tau'$, then $\tau(n) \neq \tau'(n)$. With $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$ and a good $\bar{P} = \langle P_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle$ we can associate a condition $T_\sigma = T_\sigma(\bar{P}) \in \mathbb{MII}$ as follows: let S be the smallest subset of $\omega^{<\omega}$ such that $\sigma \in S$ and if $\tau \in S$ then $P_\tau \subseteq S$; T_σ is the unique condition with $S = \text{split}(T_\sigma)$; i.e., $\sigma = \text{stem}(T_\sigma)$ and if $\tau \in \text{split}(T_\sigma)$, then $\text{succ}_{T_\sigma}(\tau) = P_\tau$. We put $\bar{P} = \langle P_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle \leq \bar{Q} = \langle Q_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle$ iff $T_\sigma(\bar{P}) \leq T_\sigma(\bar{Q})$ for all $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$ iff $P_\sigma \subseteq \text{split}(T_\sigma(\bar{Q}))$ for all $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$ (see [GJS, 4.5.]; we note that our relation " $\leq$ " corresponds to their " $\geq$ ", because our forcing-theoretic notation goes the other way round). Finally, given a $\mathbb{MII}$ -name $\check{A}$ for an infinite subset of ω , we say a good $\bar{P} = \langle P_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle$ is $\check{A}$ -*nice* iff

(♠) whenever $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$ and $\tau \in P_\sigma$, then $T_\tau(\bar{P})$ decides the first $lh(\sigma) + \tau(lh(\sigma))$ values of $\check{A}$ (more explicitly, there is $m > lh(\sigma)$ and $a_\tau = a \in [m]^{lh(\sigma) + \tau(lh(\sigma))}$ so that $T_\tau(\bar{P}) \Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} \check{A} \cap m = a$).

5.2. Lemma. *Given a $\mathbb{MII}$ -name $\check{A}$ for an element of $[\omega]^\omega$, and a good $\bar{P} = \langle P_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle$, there is $\bar{Q} = \langle Q_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle \leq \bar{P}$ which is good and $\check{A}$ -nice.*

PROOF. By recursion on $lh(\sigma)$ we construct Q_σ and an auxiliary $\tilde{Q}_\sigma$.

$\triangleright \sigma = \langle \rangle$. We let $\tilde{Q}_{\langle \rangle} = P_{\langle \rangle}$, and for each $\tau \in P_{\langle \rangle}$ we find $T'(\tau) \leq T_\tau(\bar{P})$ deciding the

first $\tau(0)$ values of $\check{A}$. Let $Q_{\langle \rangle} = \{\text{stem}(T'(\tau)); \tau \in P_{\langle \rangle}\}$. Clearly $Q_{\langle \rangle} \subseteq \text{split}(T_{\langle \rangle}(\bar{P}))$.

$\triangleright lh(\sigma) \geq 1$. If $\sigma \notin Q_{\sigma \upharpoonright n}$ for any $n < lh(\sigma)$ we proceed as in the previous case (and guarantee that $Q_\sigma \cap Q_{\sigma \upharpoonright n} = \emptyset$ for $n < lh(\sigma)$). Otherwise let $m < lh(\sigma)$ be unique with $\sigma \in Q_{\sigma \upharpoonright m}$. In this case $\sigma = \text{stem}(T'(\tilde{\tau}))$ (where the tree $T'(\tilde{\tau})$ was constructed as a subtree of a tree with stem $\tilde{\tau} \in \tilde{Q}_{\sigma \upharpoonright m}$ when defining $Q_{\sigma \upharpoonright m}$). We let $\tilde{Q}_\sigma = \text{succ}_{T'(\tilde{\tau})}(\sigma)$, and for each $\tau \in \tilde{Q}_\sigma$ we find $T'(\tau) \leq (T'(\tilde{\tau}))_\tau$ deciding the first $lh(\sigma) + \tau(lh(\sigma))$ values of $\check{A}$. Let $Q_\sigma = \{\text{stem}(T'(\tau)); \tau \in \tilde{Q}_\sigma\}$. By replacing Q_σ by a cofinite subset, if necessary, we can assume that $Q_\sigma \cap Q_{\sigma \upharpoonright n} = \emptyset$ for $n < lh(\sigma)$. Clearly $Q_\sigma \subseteq \text{split}(T_\sigma(\bar{P}))$.

This concludes the definition of the Q_σ . $\bar{Q} \leq \bar{P}$ as well as the goodness of $\bar{Q}$ are immediate. It follows easily from the construction that $T_\tau(\bar{Q}) \leq T'(\tilde{\tau})$ for $\tau \in Q_\sigma$, where $\tilde{\tau} \in \tilde{Q}_\sigma$ is such that $\sigma \subset \tilde{\tau} \subseteq \tau$, and thus the former condition indeed satisfies $(\spadesuit)$. $\square$

Next, following again [GJS, section 4], for $\bar{P} = \langle P_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle$ and $\bar{Q} = \langle Q_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle$ good, we say $\bar{P} \approx \bar{Q}$ iff $\forall \sigma (P_\sigma =^* Q_\sigma)$ and $\forall^\infty \sigma (P_\sigma = Q_\sigma)$; and we write $\bar{P} \leq^* \bar{Q}$ iff there is $\bar{P}' \approx \bar{P}$ so that $\bar{P}' \leq \bar{Q}$. Then:

5.3. Lemma. (Goldstern – Johnson – Spinas) [GJS, section 4]

(a) $\leq^*$ is transitive.

(b) Assume $MA_\lambda(\sigma\text{-centered})$. If $\langle \bar{P}^\alpha; \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ as a $\leq^*$ -decreasing sequence of good sequences, then there exists $\bar{P}^\lambda$ such that for all $\alpha < \lambda$, $\bar{P}^\lambda \leq^* \bar{P}^\alpha$. $\square$

Now we have the main tools to be able to show the preservation of $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$. By Bell's Theorem (cf 1.2.) it suffices to show that $V^{\mathbb{M}} \models "p = \kappa"$. To do this let $\lambda < \kappa$, and assume that $\langle \check{A}_\alpha; \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is a sequence of $\mathbb{M}$ -names for infinite subsets of ω so that

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} "\langle \check{A}_\alpha; \alpha < \lambda \rangle \text{ has the strong finite intersection property }."$$

We have to prove that, given $T \in \mathbb{M}$ there are $S \leq T$ and a $\mathbb{M}$ -name $\check{A}$ for a subset of ω so that

$$(+)\quad S \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} |\check{A}| = \omega \wedge \forall \alpha < \lambda (\check{A} \subseteq^* \check{A}_\alpha)."$$

Without loss $T = \omega^{<\omega}$. Let $\langle \Gamma_\alpha; \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be an enumeration of the finite subsets of λ . With each Γ_α we can associate a $\mathbb{M}$ -name $\check{A}_{\Gamma_\alpha}$ for an infinite subset of ω so that

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \check{A}_{\Gamma_\alpha} = \bigcap_{\beta \in \Gamma_\alpha} \check{A}_\beta."$$

Using Lemmata 5.2. and 5.3. (b) we can construct a $\leq^*$ -decreasing sequence $\langle \bar{P}^\alpha; \alpha \leq \lambda \rangle$ of good sequences so that $\bar{P}^\alpha$ is $\check{A}_{\Gamma_\alpha}$ -nice for $\alpha < \lambda$. Let $S' := T_{\langle \rangle}(\bar{P}^\lambda)$. We shall define

the p.o. $\mathbb{P}$ for shooting a $\mathbb{MII}$ -name for a subset of ω through S' .

For $\sigma \in \text{split}(S')$, we let $\text{pred}(\sigma)$ be the predecessor of σ in $\text{split}(S')$. By $\check{A}_{\Gamma_\alpha}$ -niceness of $\bar{P}^\alpha$ we have, for $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$ and $\tau \in P_\sigma^\alpha$, $a_{\alpha,\tau}^* \in 2^{\geq lh(\sigma) + \tau(lh(\sigma))}$ so that

$$T_\tau(\bar{P}^\alpha) \Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} \check{A}_{\Gamma_\alpha}^* \restriction lh(a_{\alpha,\tau}^*) = a_{\alpha,\tau}^*$$

(where, for $a \in [\omega]^{<\omega}$, $a^* \in 2^{<\omega}$ is the characteristic function of a — or of the restriction of a to $lh(a^*)$). We say that $\sigma \in \text{split}(S')$ is Γ_α -happy iff $T_\sigma(\bar{P}^\lambda) \leq T_\sigma(\bar{P}^\alpha)$. We note that for $\alpha < \lambda$, by definition of $\leq^*$ and the construction, almost all $\sigma \in \text{split}(S')$ are Γ_α -happy. We define:

$(\Sigma, (a_\sigma^*; \sigma \in \Sigma), \Gamma) \in \mathbb{P} \iff \Sigma \subseteq \text{split}(S')$ is finite and closed under predecessors in $\text{split}(S') \wedge a_\sigma^* \in 2^{<\omega} \wedge lh(a_\sigma^*) \geq lh(\text{pred}(\sigma)) + \sigma(lh(\text{pred}(\sigma))) \wedge (\sigma \subseteq \tau \rightarrow a_\sigma^* \subseteq a_\tau^*) \wedge \Gamma \subseteq \lambda$ is finite

$(\Sigma', (a_\sigma'; \sigma \in \Sigma'), \Gamma') \leq (\Sigma, (a_\sigma^*; \sigma \in \Sigma), \Gamma) \iff \Sigma' \supseteq \Sigma \wedge (\sigma \in \Sigma \rightarrow a_\sigma' = a_\sigma^*) \wedge \Gamma' \supseteq \Gamma \wedge \wedge \forall \sigma \in \Sigma' \setminus \Sigma \forall \alpha \in \Gamma$ (if σ is $\{\alpha\}$ -happy,

then $a_\sigma' \cap [lh(a_{\text{pred}(\sigma)}^*), lh(a_\sigma')] \subseteq a_{\beta,\sigma} \cap [lh(a_{\text{pred}(\sigma)}^*), lh(a_\sigma^*)]$

for some $\Gamma_\beta \supseteq \{\alpha\}$ so that σ is Γ_β -happy).

$\mathbb{P}$ is easily seen to be σ -centered.

5.4. Observation. Let G be $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over $N \prec H(\chi)$, where $\lambda \subseteq N$, $\mathbb{P} \in N$, and $|N| = \lambda$.

(i) For all $\alpha < \lambda$ and almost all $\sigma \in \text{split}(S')$, $a_\sigma \cap [lh(a_{\text{pred}(\sigma)}^*), lh(a_\sigma^*)] \subseteq a_{\beta,\tau} \cap [lh(a_{\text{pred}(\sigma)}^*), lh(a_\sigma^*)]$ for any $\tau \supseteq \sigma$ in $\text{split}(S')$ which is long enough (i.e. $lh(a_{\beta,\tau}^*) \geq lh(a_\sigma^*)$), where $\Gamma_\beta = \{\alpha\}$.

(ii) For all $\sigma \in \text{split}(S') \exists^\infty \tau \in P_\sigma^\lambda$ ($a_\tau \cap [lh(a_\sigma^*), lh(a_\tau^*)] \neq \emptyset$).

PROOF. (i) Use genericity and the fact that almost all $\sigma \in \text{split}(S')$ are $\{\alpha\}$ -happy.

(ii) Fix $\sigma \in \text{split}(S')$; given $(\Sigma, (a_\tau^*; \tau \in \Sigma), \Gamma) \in \mathbb{P}$ with $\sigma \in \Sigma$, almost all $\tau \in P_\sigma^\lambda$ are Γ -happy and not yet in Σ . For such τ (with long enough $\tau(lh(\sigma))$) we can find an extension with non-trivial intersection by construction. Thus genericity gives the desired result. $\square$

Next define $S \leq S'$ by recursion on its levels. Put $\langle \rangle$ into S . Assume $\sigma \in S \cap \text{split}(S')$. Then put $\tau \in P_\sigma^\lambda$ (as well as all $\tau \restriction n$) into S iff $a_\tau \cap [lh(a_\sigma^*), lh(a_\tau^*)] \neq \emptyset$. By 5.4. (ii) S is indeed a Miller tree. Let $\check{A}$ be the $\mathbb{MII}$ -name defined by $S \Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} \check{A} =$

$\bigcup_{n \in \omega}$ so that $\check{m} \restriction_{n \in \text{split}(S)} a_{\check{m} \restriction n}$, where $\check{m}$ is the name for the generic real. It is easily seen that $S \Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} |\check{A}| = \omega$.

5.5. Claim. $S \Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} \forall \alpha < \lambda (\check{A} \subseteq^* \check{A}_\alpha)$.

PROOF. Given $T \leq S$ and $\alpha < \lambda$ we have to find $T' \leq T$ and $n \in \omega$ so that

$$(++) \quad T' \Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} \check{A} \setminus n \subseteq \check{A}_\alpha.$$

To do this simply let $\sigma \in \text{split}(T)$ be so long that for all $\tau \in \text{split}(T)$ extending σ (i) of 5.4. is satisfied. Next let $n = lh(a_{pred(\sigma)}^*)$ and $T' = T_\sigma$. T' and n are easily seen to satisfy $(++)$. $\square$

Thus S satisfies $(+)$, and we are done with Theorem 5.1. $\square$

When studying the effect of a Miller real on the cardinals in Cichoń's diagram we have to assume again $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$ (or maybe something slightly weaker) to avoid the pathology of collapsing cardinals. Then we get:

5.6. Theorem. *Let $V \models ZFC$. Then*

- (a) $V^{\mathbb{MII}} \models \text{"add}(\mathcal{L}) = \omega_1\text{"}$.
- (b) *If $V \models \text{"}MA(\sigma\text{-centered}) + 2^\omega = \kappa\text{"}$, then $V^{\mathbb{MII}} \models \text{"add}(\mathcal{M}) = \kappa = 2^\omega\text{"}$.*
- (c) *If we force $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$ (as in Theorem 3.4. (c)), and then add a Miller real, we have $\text{add}(\mathcal{M}) = 2^\omega$ and $\text{cov}(\mathcal{L}) = \omega_1$.*
- (d) *If $V \models \text{"}MA + 2^\omega = \kappa\text{"}$, then $V^{\mathbb{MII}} \models \text{"cov}(\mathcal{L}) = 2^\omega = \kappa\text{"}$.*

PROOF. (a) To see that $\text{add}(\mathcal{L}) = \omega_1$ in $V^{\mathbb{MII}}$ (where V is arbitrary), we use the combinatorial characterization of this cardinal (see 1.2.). Let $\{f_\alpha; \alpha < \omega_1\} \in V$ be a family of almost-disjoint functions from ω to ω (cf the proof of Theorem 2.1.!). $\check{f}_\alpha = f_\alpha \circ \check{m}$, where $\check{m}$ is the $\mathbb{MII}$ -name for the generic, is a $\mathbb{MII}$ -name for a new real. Let $\check{\phi}$ be the $\mathbb{MII}$ -name for a slalom (i.e. $\Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} \check{\phi} \in ([\omega]^{<\omega})^\omega \wedge \forall n (|\check{\phi}(n)| = n)$) and assume that

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} \forall \alpha < \omega_1 \forall^\infty n (\check{f}_\alpha(n) \in \check{\phi}(n)).$$

Let us say $\sigma \in T$ is an n -th *splitting node* if $\sigma \in \text{split}(T)$ and for exactly n many predecessors $\tau \subseteq \sigma$, $\tau \in \text{split}(T)$. Now let T be so that: if σ is an n -th splitting node, then $T_{\sigma \restriction \langle m \rangle}$ decides $\check{\phi}(n)$ whenever $\sigma \restriction \langle m \rangle \in T$. Fix $\sigma \in \text{split}(T)$, $lh(\sigma) = n$. Say α is σ -bad iff: for almost all ℓ with $\sigma \restriction \langle \ell \rangle \in T$ for all $\tau \in T$ with $\tau \supseteq \sigma \restriction \langle \ell \rangle$ and which is an n -th splitting node and for (almost) all m with $\tau \restriction \langle m \rangle \in T$, the value forced to $\check{\phi}(n)$ contains $f_\alpha(\ell)$ [which is the value forced to $\check{f}_\alpha(n)$ by $T_{\sigma \restriction \langle \ell \rangle}$]. At most n many α can be σ -bad. Let α be such that it is

not σ -bad for any $\sigma \in \text{split}(T)$. Construct $T' \leq T$ as follows. $\text{stem}(T') = \text{stem}(T) =: \sigma$; $lh(\sigma) = n_\langle \rangle$. Choose infinitely many $\ell \in \omega$ so that $\sigma^\wedge \langle \ell \rangle \in T$ and there are $\tau_\ell \in T$ with $\tau_\ell \supseteq \sigma^\wedge \langle \ell \rangle$ and which are $n_\langle \rangle$ -th splitting nodes so that for some $m_\ell \in \omega$ with $\tau_\ell^\wedge \langle m_\ell \rangle \in T$, the value forced to $\check{\phi}(n_\langle \rangle)$ doesn't contain $f_\alpha(\ell)$. Let $\tilde{\tau}_\ell \in \text{split}(T)$ extend $\tau_\ell^\wedge \langle m_\ell \rangle$. We put all $\tilde{\tau}_\ell$ into T' . Repeat this procedure with each $\tilde{\tau}_\ell$ in place of σ ; etc. In the end we construct a condition $T' \leq T$ so that

$$T' \Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} \exists^\infty n (f_\alpha(n) \notin \check{\phi}(n)).$$

This concludes the proof of part (a).

(b) Immediate from Theorem 5.1.

(c) Rewrite the proof of Theorem 3.4. (c).

(d) Let $\langle s_n; n \in \omega \rangle$ enumerate the basic clopen sets of 2^ω . Let $\check{O}$ be a $\mathbb{MII}$ -name for an open set. Clearly we can identify $\check{O}$ with a $\mathbb{MII}$ -name $\check{f}$ for a strictly increasing function so that

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} \check{O} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} s_{\check{f}(n)}.$$

We say a good $\bar{P} = \langle P_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle$ is $\check{O}$ -soft iff

($\heartsuit$) there is a function $f : \omega^{<\omega} \rightarrow \omega^{<\omega}$ so that $\forall \sigma, \tau \in \omega^{<\omega}$

(I) $\tau \in P_\sigma$ implies $f(\sigma) \subseteq f(\tau)$;

(II) $T_\tau(\bar{P}) \Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} f(\tau) = \check{f} \restriction lh(f(\tau))$;

(III) $\forall k \in \omega \forall h \in [T_\tau(\bar{P})] \exists \rho \in \text{split}(T_\tau(\bar{P})) (lh(f(\rho)) \geq k \wedge \rho \subseteq h)$;

(IV) $\tau \in P_\sigma$ and $\tau(lh(\sigma)) \geq m$ imply $T_\tau(\bar{P}) \Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} \mu(\check{O} \setminus \bigcup_{n \in lh(f(\tau))} s_{\check{f}(n)}) \leq \frac{1}{m}$.

5.7. Lemma. *Given $\mathbb{MII}$ -names $\check{O}$ and $\check{f}$ as above and a good $\bar{P} = \langle P_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle$, there is $\bar{Q} = \langle Q_\sigma; \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} \rangle \leq \bar{P}$ which is good and $\check{O}$ -soft.*

PROOF. The proof is similar to the one of 5.2. — we proceed by recursion on $lh(\sigma)$, and construct Q_σ , $\tilde{Q}_\sigma$ and f .

$\triangleright \sigma = \langle \rangle$. We let $\tilde{Q}_\langle \rangle = P_\langle \rangle$. Let $f(\langle \rangle) = \langle \rangle$. Fix $\tau \in P_\langle \rangle$; find $T'(\tau) \leq T_\tau(\bar{P})$ and $\ell \in \omega$, $\ell \geq 1$, so that

$$T'(\tau) \Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} \mu(\check{O} \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \ell} s_{\check{f}(n)}) \leq \frac{1}{\tau(0)}$$

and $T'(\tau)$ decides the first ℓ values of $\check{f}$; say $T'(\tau) \Vdash_{\mathbb{MII}} \check{f} \restriction \ell = \rho$. Set $f(\text{stem}(T'(\tau))) = \rho$, and — unfixing τ — let $Q_\langle \rangle = \{\text{stem}(T'(\tau)); \tau \in P_\langle \rangle\}$.

$\triangleright lh(\sigma) \geq 1$. If $\sigma \notin Q_{\sigma \upharpoonright n}$ for any $n < lh(\sigma)$ we proceed as above (letting $f(\sigma) = \langle \rangle$ and guaranteeing $Q_\sigma \cap Q_{\sigma \upharpoonright n} = \emptyset$ for $n < lh(\sigma)$). Otherwise let $m < lh(\sigma)$ be unique with $\sigma \in Q_{\sigma \upharpoonright m}$. Then $\sigma = stem(T'(\tilde{\tau}))$ (where $\sigma \upharpoonright m \subset \tilde{\tau} \subseteq \sigma$ and $\tilde{\tau} \in \tilde{Q}_{\sigma \upharpoonright m}$). Note that $f(\sigma)$ has been defined already. Let $\tilde{Q}_\sigma = succ_{T'(\tilde{\tau})}(\sigma)$. Fix $\tau \in \tilde{Q}_\sigma$; find $T'(\tau) \leq (T'(\tilde{\tau}))_\tau$ and $\ell \geq \max\{lh(\sigma), lh(f(\sigma))\}$ so that

$$T'(\tau) \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \mu(\check{O} \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \ell} s_{\check{f}(n)}) \leq \frac{1}{\tau(lh(\sigma))}$$

and $T'(\tau)$ decides the first ℓ values of $\check{f}$; say $T'(\tau) \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \check{f} \upharpoonright \ell = \rho$. Set $f(stem(T'(\tau))) = \rho$, and — unfixing τ — let $Q_\sigma = \{stem(T'(\tau)); \tau \in \tilde{Q}_\sigma\}$ (without loss disjoint from $Q_{\sigma \upharpoonright n}$ for $n < lh(\sigma)$).

Then $\bar{Q} \leq \bar{P}$ is easily seen to be good and $\check{O}$ -soft. $\square$

We note that if $\bar{P} \leq \bar{Q}$, $\bar{P}$ and $\bar{Q}$ are good, and $\bar{Q}$ is $\check{O}$ -soft, then $\bar{P}$ is $\check{O}$ -soft as well, and this is witnessed by the same function f . If $\bar{P} \leq^* \bar{Q}$, $\bar{P}$ and $\bar{Q}$ good and $\bar{Q}$ $\check{O}$ -soft, then (I) – (III) in $(\heartsuit)$ are satisfied (redefine the function f at finitely many places) and (IV) is satisfied for almost all σ , and for σ for which it does not hold, it is still satisfied for almost all $\tau \in P_\sigma$. We call $\bar{P}$ with these properties *almost $\check{O}$ -soft*.

Fix $x \in 2^\omega$. We define the rank function $\rho_x = \rho_x^{\bar{P}}$ on $\omega^{<\omega}$ (where $\bar{P}$ is good and almost $\check{O}$ -soft).

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_x(\tau) = 0 &\longleftrightarrow x \in \bigcup_{m < lh(f(\tau))} s_{f(\tau)(m)}; \\ \rho_x(\tau) = \alpha &\longleftrightarrow \text{for no } \beta < \alpha \text{ do we have } \rho_x(\tau) = \beta \\ &\text{and } \forall^\infty \sigma \in P_\tau (\rho_x(\sigma) < \alpha); \\ \rho_x(\tau) = \infty &\longleftrightarrow \text{for no } \beta < \omega_1 \text{ do we have } \rho_x(\tau) = \beta. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the statement " $\rho_x(\sigma) = \infty$ " is equivalent to the existence of $\bar{Q} \leq \bar{P}$, $\bar{Q}$ good, $\forall \tau \in \omega^{<\omega}$ ($Q_\tau \subseteq P_\tau$) such that $\forall \tau \in split(T_\sigma(\bar{Q}))$ ($x \notin \bigcup_{m < lh(f(\tau))} s_{f(\tau)(m)}$). The latter is easily seen to be a Σ_1^1 -statement about x (with parameters $\bar{P}$ and f); hence $H_\sigma = H_\sigma^{\bar{P}} := \{x; \rho_x(\sigma) < \omega_1\}$ is Π_1^1 and thus measurable.

5.8. Lemma. *Let $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$, $\bar{P}$ good and almost $\check{O}$ -soft, and assume $T_\sigma(\bar{P}) \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \mu(\check{O}) \leq \mu$, for some $\mu \leq 1$. Then $\mu(H_\sigma) \leq \mu$.*

PROOF. We show by induction on $\alpha < \omega_1$ simultaneously for all $\tau \in split(T_\sigma(\bar{P}))$ that $\mu(\{x; \rho_x(\tau) \leq \alpha\}) \leq \mu$.

$\triangleright \alpha = 0$. As $T_\tau(\bar{P}) \Vdash_{\text{MII}} \mu(\check{O}) \leq \mu$ and $T_\tau(\bar{P}) \Vdash_{\text{MII}} \bigcup_{m < lh(f(\tau))} s_{f(\tau)(m)} \subseteq \check{O}$, this is immediate.

$\triangleright \alpha > 0$. Note that $\{x; \rho_x(\tau) \leq \alpha\} = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \bigcap_{\tilde{\tau} \in P_\tau \text{ with } \tilde{\tau}(lh(\tau)) > i} \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \{x; \rho_x(\tilde{\tau}) \leq \beta\}$. The set on the right-hand side is easily seen to have measure $\leq \mu$, by induction. $\square$

Note that if $\bar{Q} \leq \bar{P}$, $\bar{Q}$ and $\bar{P}$ good and $\bar{P}$ almost $\check{O}$ -soft, and $\forall \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} (Q_\sigma \subseteq^* P_\sigma)$, then $H_\sigma^{\bar{Q}} \supseteq H_\sigma^{\bar{P}}$ for all $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$. Let us say an almost $\check{O}$ -soft good $\bar{P}$ is $\check{O}$ -maximal iff whenever $\bar{Q} \leq^* \bar{P}$ good and $\forall \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} (Q_\sigma \subseteq^* P_\sigma)$, then $\forall \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} (\mu(H_\sigma^{\bar{Q}}) = \mu(H_\sigma^{\bar{P}}))$.

5.9. Observation. *Given an almost $\check{O}$ -soft good $\bar{P}$, there is $\bar{Q} \leq^* \bar{P}$ such that $\forall \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} (Q_\sigma \subseteq^* P_\sigma)$ and $\bar{Q}$ is $\check{O}$ -maximal.*

PROOF. If $\bar{P}$ is almost $\check{O}$ -soft good and not $\check{O}$ -maximal, then we can find $\bar{Q} \leq^* \bar{P}$ so that $\forall \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} (Q_\sigma \subseteq^* P_\sigma)$ and $\tau \in \omega^{<\omega}$ so that $\mu(H_\tau^{\bar{Q}}) > \mu(H_\tau^{\bar{P}})$. Thus if there were no $\bar{Q} \leq^* \bar{P}$ with $\forall \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} (Q_\sigma \subseteq^* P_\sigma)$ which is $\check{O}$ -maximal, we could construct a sequence $\langle \bar{P}^\alpha; \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ so that $\alpha < \beta$ implies $\bar{P}^\beta \leq^* \bar{P}^\alpha$, $\forall \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega} (P_\sigma^\beta \subseteq^* P_\sigma^\alpha)$ and $\forall \alpha < \omega_1 \exists \tau \in \omega^{<\omega}$ so that $\mu(H_\tau^{\bar{P}^{\alpha+1}}) < \mu(H_\tau^{\bar{P}^\alpha})$, a contradiction. $\square$

Equipped with these lemmata (as well as Lemma 5.3.) we are ready for the proof that $cov(\mathcal{L}) = \kappa$ in the last model. Assume $\lambda < \kappa$ and $\langle \check{N}^\alpha; \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is a sequence of MII-names for null G_δ 's. Let $\check{U}_n^\alpha$, $n \in \omega$, be MII-names for open sets so that

$$\Vdash_{\text{MII}} \forall n (\mu(\check{U}_n^\alpha) \leq \frac{1}{2^n}) \wedge \check{N}^\alpha = \bigcap_n \check{U}_n^\alpha.$$

Given $T \in \text{MII}$ we shall produce $S \leq T$ and a MII-name $\check{x}$ for an object in 2^ω so that

$$(*) \quad S \Vdash_{\text{MII}} \forall \alpha < \lambda (\check{x} \notin \check{N}^\alpha).$$

Without loss $T = \omega^{<\omega}$. Let $\langle \check{O}^\alpha; \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be an enumeration of MII-names for all finite unions of the names $\check{U}_n^\alpha$. Let $\check{f}^\alpha$, $\alpha < \lambda$, be the names for the corresponding functions (i.e. $\Vdash_{\text{MII}} \check{O}^\alpha = \bigcup_n s_{\check{f}^\alpha(n)}$). Using Lemmata 5.7. and 5.3. construct a $\leq^*$ -decreasing sequence $\langle \bar{P}^\alpha; \alpha \leq \lambda \rangle$ of good sequences so that for all $\alpha < \lambda$, $\bar{P}^\alpha$ is $\check{O}^\alpha$ -soft. Then $\bar{P}^\lambda$ is almost $\check{O}^\alpha$ -soft for all $\alpha < \lambda$. Making another construction of length λ , if necessary, using 5.9. and (essentially) 3.6. (at limit steps), we can assume that $\bar{P}^\lambda$ is $\check{O}^\alpha$ -maximal for all $\alpha < \lambda$. Let f^α be the function witnessing this; and let $H_\sigma^\alpha := H_\sigma^{\alpha, \bar{P}^\lambda}$ be defined as above (before 5.8.) for $\alpha < \lambda$ and $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$.

We define the p.o. $\mathbb{Q}$ for shooting a Miller tree through $S' := T_\langle \rangle(\bar{P}^\lambda)$ and producing a name for a real. Conditions of $\mathbb{Q}$ are of the form $p = (\Sigma^p, (\bar{B}_\sigma^p; \sigma \in \Sigma^p), \Gamma^p) = (\sigma, (\bar{B}_\sigma; \sigma \in$

$\Sigma), \Gamma)$ so that

- (i) $\Sigma \subseteq \text{split}(S')$ is finite and closed under predecessors in $\text{split}(S')$;
- (ii) $\bar{B}_\sigma = \langle B_{\sigma,0}, \dots, B_{\sigma,n_\sigma-1} \rangle$ where $B_{\sigma,i} \in \mathbb{B}$;
- (iii) $i < j < n_\sigma$ implies $B_{\sigma,i} \supseteq B_{\sigma,j}$;
- (iv) $\tau \in P_\sigma \cap \Sigma$ and $\tau(lh(\sigma)) \geq i$ imply $i < n_\sigma - 1$ and $B_{\tau,j} \subseteq B_{\sigma,i}$ for any $j \in n_\tau$;
- (v) if $\tau \in \Sigma$ is a final node (i.e. $P_\tau \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$), then $n_\tau = 1$;
- (vi) $\Gamma \in [\lambda \times \omega]^{<\omega}$;
- (vii) letting $\alpha = \alpha(\Gamma)$ be such that $\|_{-\mathbb{M}} \check{O}^\alpha = \bigcup_{(\beta,n) \in \Gamma} \check{U}_n^{\beta,n}$, we have $\forall \sigma \in \Sigma$ ($H_\sigma^\alpha \cap B_{\sigma,n_\sigma-1} = \emptyset$).

We put $(\Sigma^p, (\bar{B}_\sigma^p; \sigma \in \Sigma^p), \Gamma^p) = p \leq q = (\Sigma^q, (\bar{B}_\sigma^q; \sigma \in \Sigma^q), \Gamma^q)$ iff

- (I) $\Sigma^p \supseteq \Sigma^q$;
- (II) $n_\sigma^p \geq n_\sigma^q$ and $B_{\sigma,i}^p \subseteq B_{\sigma,i}^q$ for $\sigma \in \Sigma^q$ and $i < n_\sigma^q$;
- (III) $\Gamma^p \supseteq \Gamma^q$.

5.10. Main Lemma. $\mathbb{Q}$ is ccc.

PROOF. Let $\langle p^\beta = (\Sigma^\beta, (\bar{B}_\sigma^\beta; \sigma \in \Sigma^\beta), \Gamma^\beta); \beta < \omega_1 \rangle$ be a sequence of elements of $\mathbb{Q}$. Going over to stronger conditions, if necessary, we can assume there are Σ, n_σ ($\sigma \in \Sigma$) and $B_{\sigma,i}$ ($\sigma \in \Sigma, i \in n_\sigma$) so that $\Sigma^\beta = \Sigma, n_\sigma^\beta = n_\sigma$ and $B_{\sigma,i}^\beta = B_{\sigma,i}$ for all $\beta < \omega_1$ (using MA_{ω_1} for the latter — see [Tr 1, Lemma 5.1.]). We have to find $\beta < \gamma$ so that, letting $\alpha = \alpha(\Gamma^\beta \cup \Gamma^\gamma)$, $\mu(B_{\sigma,n_\sigma-1} \setminus H_\sigma^\alpha) > 0$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$; then p^β and p^γ will be compatible. This is not trivial, for we may have $\mu(H_\sigma^\alpha \setminus (H_\sigma^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)} \cup H_\sigma^{\alpha(\Gamma^\gamma)})) > 0$.

Let $\Sigma = \{\sigma_i; i \in k\}$. We shall produce $\Delta_i \in [\omega_1]^{\omega_1}, \Delta_{i+1} \subseteq \Delta_i$ so that when $\beta, \gamma \in \Delta_i$ then $\mu(B_{\sigma_i,n_{\sigma_i}-1} \setminus H_{\sigma_i}^\alpha) > 0$ where $\alpha = \alpha(\Gamma^\beta \cup \Gamma^\gamma)$. Fix $i < k$, and suppose Δ_{i-1} has been constructed (where $\Delta_{-1} = \omega_1$). Let $B := B_{\sigma_i,n_{\sigma_i}-1}$. Fix $\beta \in \Delta_{i-1}$. We claim that there is n^β so that $\forall^\infty \tau \in P_{\sigma_i}^\lambda$ ($\mu(B \setminus H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)}) \geq \frac{1}{n^\beta}$). (**)

For suppose not. Fix $g \in \omega^{<\omega}$ increasing and find $\{\tau_n; n \in \omega\} \subseteq P_{\sigma_i}^\lambda$ so that $\mu(B \setminus H_{\tau_n}^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)}) < \frac{1}{g(n)}$. Let $\bar{P}^* \leq \bar{P}^\lambda$ be defined by

$$P_\sigma^* = \begin{cases} \{\tau_n; n \in \omega\}, & \text{if } \sigma = \sigma_i \\ P_\sigma, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $\mu(H_{\sigma_i}^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta), \bar{P}^*} \cap B) = \mu((\bigcup_{m \in \omega} \bigcap_{n \geq m} H_{\tau_n}^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)}) \cap B) > 0$, contradicting $\check{O}^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)}$ -maximality of $\bar{P}^\lambda$. This shows (**).

Without loss there is n so that $n_\beta = n$ for all $\beta \in \Delta_{i-1}$. Let $\Gamma \in [\Delta_{i-1}]^{2n}$. Assume that for all pairs $\{\beta, \gamma\} \in [\Gamma]^2$ we have $\mu(B \setminus H_{\sigma_i}^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta \cup \Gamma^\gamma)}) = 0$ (***). Find $\tau \in P_{\sigma_i}^\lambda$ so that $\tau(lh(\sigma_i)) \geq n^4$, τ satisfies (IV) in ($\heartsuit$) for all $\beta \in \Gamma$, $\mu(B \setminus H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)}) \geq \frac{1}{n}$ for all $\beta \in \Gamma$ (by (**)), and $\mu(B \setminus H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta \cup \Gamma^\gamma)}) < \frac{1}{n^4}$ for all $\{\beta, \gamma\} \in [\Gamma]^2$ (by (***)). Given $\beta \in \Gamma$, we have (by (IV) in ($\heartsuit$))

$$T_\tau(\bar{P}^\lambda) \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \mu(\check{O}^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)} \setminus \bigcup_{n \in lh(f^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)}(\tau))} s_{\check{f}^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)}(n)}) \leq \frac{1}{n^4}.$$

Note that $\bigcup_{n \in lh(f^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)}(\tau))} s_{f^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)}(\tau)(n)} \subseteq H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)}$; thus for $\{\beta, \gamma\} \in [\Gamma]^2$,

$$T_\tau(\bar{P}^\lambda) \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \mu(\check{O}^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta \cup \Gamma^\gamma)} \setminus (H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)} \cup H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\gamma)})) \leq \frac{2}{n^4},$$

hence by Lemma 5.8., $\mu(H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta \cup \Gamma^\gamma)} \setminus (H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)} \cup H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\gamma)})) \leq \frac{2}{n^4}$. Therefore we get $\mu(B \setminus (H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)} \cup H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\gamma)})) \leq \frac{3}{n^4}$ for all $\{\beta, \gamma\} \in [\Gamma]^2$.

Note, however, that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 &\leq \sum_{\beta \in \Gamma} \mu(B \setminus H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)}) \\ &\leq \mu(\{x; |\{\beta \in \Gamma; x \in B \setminus H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)}\}| \leq 1\}) + 2 \cdot n \cdot \mu(\{x; |\{\beta \in \Gamma; x \in B \setminus H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta)}\}| \geq 2\}) \\ &\leq 1 + 2 \cdot n \cdot n^2 \cdot \frac{3}{n^4} = 1 + \frac{6}{n} < 2, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction to (***). Applying the partition relation $\omega_1 \rightarrow (\omega, \omega_1)^2$, we easily get $\Delta_i \in [\Delta_{i-1}]^{\omega_1}$ so that for all pairs $\{\beta, \gamma\} \in [\Delta_i]^2$ we have $\mu(B \setminus H_{\sigma_i}^{\alpha(\Gamma^\beta \cup \Gamma^\gamma)}) > 0$. This proves the Main Lemma. $\square$

5.11. Observation. Let G be $\mathbb{Q}$ -generic over $N \prec H(\chi)$, where $\lambda \subseteq N$, $\mathbb{Q} \in N$, and $|N| = \lambda$.

(i) $\hat{S} := \cup\{\Sigma^p; p \in G\}$ is the set of splitting nodes of a Miller tree S ; in fact, whenever $\sigma \in \hat{S}$, then $|P_\sigma^\lambda \cap \hat{S}| = \omega$.

(ii) For $\sigma \in \hat{S}$ and $i \in \omega$ set $\hat{B}_{\sigma,i} := \cap\{B_{\sigma,i}^p; p \in G\}$. Then $\hat{B}_{\sigma,i}$ is a closed (and non-empty) set of reals, $i < j$ implies $\hat{B}_{\sigma,i} \supseteq \hat{B}_{\sigma,j}$, $\tau \in P_\sigma \cap \hat{S}$ and $\tau(lh(\sigma)) \geq i$ imply $\hat{B}_{\tau,j} \subseteq \hat{B}_{\sigma,i}$ for any j , and for any $f \in [S]$, we have $|\bigcap_{f \restriction n \in \hat{S}} \hat{B}_{f \restriction n, 0}| = 1$ (and this is still true for any branch of S in any larger model; thus the family $\{\hat{B}_{\sigma,0}; \sigma \in \hat{S}\}$ can be thought of as a $\mathbb{M}$ -name for a real).

(iii) $\forall \beta < \lambda \exists n \in \omega \forall \sigma \in \hat{S} \forall^\infty i \in \omega (\hat{B}_{\sigma,i} \cap H_\sigma^{\{(\beta,n)\}} = 0)$.

PROOF. (i) Use genericity and the fact that given $p, \sigma \in \Sigma^p$ and $i \in \omega$, we can find $q \leq p, \tau \in P_\sigma$ with $\tau(lh(\sigma)) \geq i$ and $\tau \in \Sigma^q$.

(ii) Using genericity and the fact that given $p, B_{\sigma,i}^p$ we can find $q \leq p$ so that $B_{\sigma,i}^q$ is closed, we get closedness. The rest is easy.

(iii) By genericity it suffices to show that given $p, \beta < \lambda$, there are $n \in \omega$ and $q \leq p$ with $(\beta, n) \in \Gamma^q$. To see this we use an argument similar to the one in the proof of 5.10. Let $\Sigma^p = \{\sigma_i; i \in k\}$. Using $\check{O}^{\alpha(\Gamma^p)}$ -maximality of $\bar{P}^\lambda$, find n_i ($i \in k$) so that $\forall^\infty \tau \in P_{\sigma_i}^\lambda (\mu(B_i \setminus H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^p)}) \geq \frac{1}{n_i})$, where $B_i = B_{\sigma_i, n_{\sigma_i}-1}$ (this is $(**)$ in 5.10.). Let $n > \max_{i \in k} n_i$. We set $\Gamma^q = \Gamma^p \cup \{(\beta, n)\}$. Fix $i \in k$. As in 5.10. $\mu(H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^q)} \setminus (H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^p)} \cup H_\tau^{\alpha(\{(\beta,n)\})})) \rightarrow 0$ for $\tau(lh(\sigma_i)) \rightarrow \infty$ ($\tau \in P_{\sigma_i}^\lambda$). Also (by Lemma 5.8.) $\mu(H_\tau^{\alpha(\{(\beta,n)\})}) \leq \frac{1}{n}$. Hence $\liminf_{\tau \in P_{\sigma_i}^\lambda} \mu(B_i \setminus H_\tau^{\alpha(\Gamma^q)}) \geq \frac{1}{n_i} - \frac{1}{n}$. Thus $\mu(B_i \setminus H_{\sigma_i}^{\alpha(\Gamma^q)}) > 0$. This means we can make a straightforward extension to a condition q . $\square$

5.12. Claim. $S \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \forall \alpha < \lambda (\check{x} \notin \check{N}^\alpha)$, where $\check{x}$ is the $\mathbb{M}$ -name given by 5.11. (ii).

PROOF. Suppose, by way of contradiction, that for some $\beta < \lambda$ and some $T \leq S$,

$$T \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \check{x} \in \check{N}^\beta.$$

Choose $n \in \omega$ so that for some $p \in G$, $(\beta, n) \in \Gamma^p$. Clearly $T \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \check{x} \in \check{U}_n^\beta = \check{O}^\alpha$, where $\alpha = \alpha(\{(\beta, n)\})$. Find $k \in \omega$ and $T' \leq T$ so that

$$T' \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \check{x} \in s_{f^\alpha(k)}.$$

Let $\tau \in \text{split}(T')$ so that $lh(f^\alpha(\tau)) \geq k + 1$. Then $T'_\tau \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \check{x} \in s_{f^\alpha(\tau)(k)} \subseteq H_\tau^\alpha$ (+). Choose $q \leq p, q \in G$ so that $\tau \in \Sigma^q$. Then $H_\tau^\alpha \cap B_{\tau, n_\tau^q-1}^q = \emptyset$, in particular $s_{f^\alpha(\tau)(k)} \cap B_{\tau, n_\tau^q-1}^q = \emptyset$. Choose $\tilde{\tau} \in P_\tau^\lambda \cap T'$ with $\tilde{\tau}(lh(\tau)) \geq n_\tau^q - 1$, and $r \leq q, r \in G$ so that $\tilde{\tau} \in \Sigma^r$. Then $\hat{B}_{\tilde{\tau}, 0}^q \subseteq B_{\tilde{\tau}, 0}^r \subseteq B_{\tau, n_\tau^q-1}^q$, and

$$T'_{\tilde{\tau}} \Vdash_{\mathbb{M}} \check{x} \in \hat{B}_{\tilde{\tau}, 0}^q,$$

contradicting (+). $\square$

Thus S and $\check{x}$ satisfy $(*)$, and Theorem 5.6. is proved. $\square$

Theorems 5.1. and 5.6. say that the behaviour of Miller forcing is rather similar to that of Cohen forcing: both preserve $MA(\sigma\text{-centered})$ and both collapse $\text{add}(\mathcal{L})$ to ω_1 (cf

the first paragraph of the Introduction for Cohen forcing). It seems that any "reasonable" forcing notion generated by a name for an unbounded real does the latter (compare this to Question 3.11.).

We believe that a similar argument as the one in part (d) above should yield the same result for adding a Laver real (and thus positively answer Question 3.7.). The main problem is that when defining $\check{O}$ -softness ($\heartsuit$) we cannot require something corresponding to condition (IV) for Laver forcing; and thus we do not know whether the p.o. $\mathbb{Q}$ will be *ccc* in the Laver case.

We also note that it seems to be a general state of affairs that "reasonable" p.o.'s adding a single real can only collapse cardinal invariants (in *ZFC*) which are dual to cardinals which are increased by iterating the same forcing. E.g.: a single Cohen real collapses $\text{cov}(\mathcal{L})$ and iterated Cohen forcing increases $\text{unif}(\mathcal{L})$; or: a single Laver real collapses $\mathfrak{d}$ and iterated Laver forcing increases $\mathfrak{b}$. According to this philosophy, it should be consistent that $\text{cov}(\mathcal{L})$ is still large after one Laver real, for Woodin (unpublished) and (later, but independently) Judah and Shelah [JS 2, section 1] showed that Laver forcing preserves outer measure (and thus the iteration does not increase $\text{unif}(\mathcal{L})$).

Of course one may investigate other related forcings as well — our choice was motivated by selecting forcings which have some effect on cardinal invariants when iterated. An example which leaves all cardinal invariants small (and just increases 2^ω) is iterated Sacks forcing. This seemingly corresponds to a result of Carlson's and Laver's [CL] that Sacks forcing may preserve the full extent of *MA*.

REFERENCES

- [Ba] T. BARTOSZYŃSKI, *Combinatorial aspects of measure and category*, Fundamenta Mathematicae, vol. 127 (1987), pp. 225-239.
- [BaJS] T. BARTOSZYŃSKI, H. JUDAH AND S. SHELAH, *The Cichoń diagram*, submitted to Journal of Symbolic Logic.
- [BS] T. BARTOSZYŃSKI AND S. SHELAH, *Closed measure zero sets*, Annals of Pure

- and Applied Logic, vol. 58 (1992), pp. 93-110.
- [Be] M. G. BELL, *On the combinatorial principle $P(c)$* , Fundamenta Mathematicae, vol. 114 (1981), pp. 149-157.
- [Bl] A. BLASS, *Selective ultrafilters and homogeneity*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, vol. 38 (1988), pp. 215-255.
- [Br 1] J. BRENDLE, *Larger cardinals in Cichoń's diagram*, Journal of Symbolic Logic, vol. 56 (1991), pp. 795-810.
- [Br 2] J. BRENDLE, *Amoeba-absoluteness and projective measurability*, to appear in Journal of Symbolic Logic.
- [BJS] J. BRENDLE, H. JUDAH AND S. SHELAH, *Combinatorial properties of Hechler forcing*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, vol. 58 (1992), pp. 185-199.
- [CL] T. CARLSON AND R. LAVER, *Sacks reals and Martin's axiom*, Fundamenta Mathematicae, vol. 133 (1989), pp. 161-169.
- [CP] J. CICHÓN AND J. PAWLIKOWSKI, *On ideals of subsets of the plane and on Cohen reals*, Journal of Symbolic Logic, vol. 51 (1986), pp. 560-569.
- [Fr] D. FREMLIN, *Cichoń's diagram*, Séminaire Initiation à l'Analyse (G. Choquet, M. Rogalski, J. Saint Raymond), Publications Mathématiques de l'Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, 1984, pp. 5-01 - 5-13.
- [GJS] M. GOLDSTERN, M. JOHNSON AND O. SPINAS, *Towers on trees*, to appear in Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society.
- [GRSS] M. GOLDSTERN, M. REPICKÝ, S. SHELAH AND O. SPINAS, *On tree ideals*, preprint.
- [Ha] L. HALBEISEN, in preparation.
- [Je 1] T. JECH, *Set theory*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1978.
- [Je 2] T. JECH, *Multiple forcing*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- [Ju 1] H. JUDAH, Σ_2^1 -sets of reals, Journal of Symbolic Logic, vol. 53 (1988), pp. 636-642.
- [Ju 2] H. JUDAH, *Absoluteness for projective sets*, to appear in Logic Colloquium 1990.
- [JMS] H. JUDAH, A. MILLER AND S. SHELAH, *Sacks forcing, Laver forcing, and Martin's Axiom*, Archive for Mathematical Logic, vol. 31 (1992), pp. 145-162.

- [JS 1] H. JUDAH AND S. SHELAH, Δ_2^1 -sets of reals, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 42 (1989), pp. 207-223.
- [JS 2] H. JUDAH AND S. SHELAH, *The Kunen-Miller chart (Lebesgue measure, the Baire property, Laver reals and preservation theorems for forcing)*, *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 55 (1990), pp. 909-927.
- [Ku] K. KUNEN, *Set theory*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1980.
- [Ma] A. R. D. MATHIAS, *Happy families*, *Annals of Mathematical Logic*, vol. 12 (1977), pp. 59-111.
- [Mi 1] A. MILLER, *Some properties of measure and category*, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 266 (1981), pp. 93-114.
- [Mi 2] A. MILLER, *Rational perfect set forcing*, *Contemporary Mathematics*, vol. 31 (Axiomatic Set Theory, 1984, edited by J. Baumgartner, D. Martin and S. Shelah), pp. 143-159.
- [Pa 1] J. PAWLIKOWSKI, *Powers of transitive bases of measure and category*, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 93 (1985), pp. 719-729.
- [Pa 2] J. PAWLIKOWSKI, *Why Solovay real produces Cohen real*, *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 51 (1986), pp. 957-968.
- [Ro] J. ROITMAN, *Adding a random or a Cohen real: topological consequences and the effect on Martin's axiom*, *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, vol. 103 (1979), pp. 47-60 and vol. 129 (1988), p. 141.
- [RS] A. ROSŁANOWSKI AND S. SHELAH, *More forcing notions imply diamond*, preprint.
- [SW] S. SHELAH AND H. WOODIN, *Forcing the failure of CH by adding a real*, *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 49 (1984), pp. 1185-1189.
- [Si] J. SILVER, *Every analytic set is Ramsey*, *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 35 (1970), pp. 60-64.
- [Tr 1] J. TRUSS, *Sets having calibre $\aleph_1$* , in: R. O. Gandy and J. M. E. Hyland, eds., *Logic Colloquium '76* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977), pp. 595-612.
- [Tr 2] J. TRUSS, *The noncommutativity of random and generic extensions*, *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 48 (1983), pp. 1008-1012.
- [Tr 3] J. TRUSS, *Connections between different amoeba algebras*, *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, vol. 130 (1988), pp. 137-155.

- [vD] E. K. VAN DOUWEN, *The integers and topology*, Handbook of set-theoretic topology, K. Kunen and J. E. Vaughan (editors), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 111-167.
- [Wo] W. H. WOODIN, *On the consistency strength of projective uniformization*, Proceedings of the Herbrand Symposium, Logic Colloquium '81, J. Stern (ed.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982, 365-384.